arXiv:1303.1224v1 [math.AP] 6 Mar 2013

Homogenisation in finite elasticity for composites with a high contrast in the vicinity of rigid-body motions

M. Cherdantsev, K. D. Cherednichenko[*], S. Neukamm[†]

March 7, 2013

Abstract

We present a multiscale asymptotic framework for the analysis of the macroscopic behaviour of periodic two-material composites with high contrast in a finite-strain setting. Our derivation starts with the geometrically nonlinear description of a composite consisting of a stiff material matrix and soft, periodically distributed inclusions, where the contrast between the components is coupled with the period ε. We assume that the deformation field is a rigid-body motion on some part of the boundary of the composite, and consider various loading regimes, which are controlled by an additional parameter λ_ε. We show that for particular regimes the elastic displacements are small throughout the material as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and that the deformation gradients in the stiff material are situated in the vicinity of the rigid-body motion specified by the boundary condition. This allows to replace, in the homogenisation limit, the nonlinear material law of the stiff component by its linearised version. The behaviour of the deformation gradients on the soft component depends on the asymptotics of λ_ε. In particular, in the case $\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$ they are shown to be of order one, and the related contribution to the homogenised energy is expressed via the quasiconvex envelope of the original stored-energy density defined on suitably rescaled gradient fields. As a main result we derive, in the spirit of Γ-convergence, a limit energy functional and establish a precise two-scale expansion for minimising sequences.

1 Introduction

In the present work we continue the multiscale theme initiated in [14] and study the homogenisation of two-material composites with high contrast. We study geometrically nonlinear elastic composites with periodically distributed soft inclusions. For applied loads that satisfy a certain smallness condition we derive in the spirit of Γ-convergence an effective two-scale model that — depending on the scaling of the load — is either a homogenised, linearised functional, or a homogenised, partially linearised energy functional that still allows for large strains in the soft inclusions. In the former case we prove that minimisers admit a specific two-scale expansion that is determined by the limiting model.

While our work is one of the few papers, along with [14], [6], that treat the fully nonlinear high-contrast case, there has been a significant body of literature during the last decade devoted to the mathematical analysis of phenomena associated with, or modelled by, a high degree of contrast between the properties of the materials constituting a composite, in the linearised setting. The first contributions in this direction are due to Zhikov [39], and Bouchitté and Felbacq [5], following an earlier paper by Allaire [1] and the collection of papers by Hornung *et al.* [24] (see also the references therein), where the special role of high-contrast elliptic PDE was pointed out albeit not studied in detail. These works demonstrated that the behaviour of the field variable in such models is of a two-scale type "in the very limit" as the period of the composite goes to zero. They also noticed that the spectrum of such materials has a band-gap structure and indicated how this fact could be exploited for high-resolution imaging and cloaking. It has since been an adopted approach to the theoretical construction of "negative refraction" media, or more generally "metamaterials", which is now a hugely popular area of research in physics (see *e.g* [34] and references therein). On the analytical side, a number of further works followed, in particular [3], [4], [9], [10], [11], [13], [26], [12], [36], where various consequences of high contrast (or, mathematically speaking, the property of non-uniform ellipticity) in the underlying equations have been explored. Among these are the "non-locality" and "micro-torsion" effects in materials with high-contrast inclusions in the shape of fibres extending in one or more directions, the "partial band-gap" wave propagation due to the high degree of anisotropy of one of the constituent media, and the localisation of energy in high-contrast media with a defect ("photonic crystal fibres"), all of which can be thought of as examples of "non-standard", or "non-classical", behaviour in composites, which is not available in the usual moderate-contrast materials. Our goal is to develop a rigorous high contrast theory in a context where the underlying nonlinearity is an essential feature of the material description, such as that of finite elasticity. In particular, here we focus on the case when the deformation gradients induced by the applied forces are situated near the group of rotations SO(3) in the main "stiff" material and are bounded (while being possibly a finite distance away from SO(3)) in the "soft" material of the inclusions. This kind of nonlinearity necessitates the development of two-scale homogenisation in combination with a rigidity statement in the spirit of Friesecke, James and Müller [23], which we carry out in the present work.

---

[*] School of Mathematics, Cardiff University, Senghennydd Road, Cardiff, CF24 4AG, United Kingdom

[†] Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstraße 22, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

We next give a more detailed outline of the present article. The starting point of our analysis is the elastic energy functional

$$\int_\Omega W_\varepsilon(x,\nabla u)\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

where $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ (for dimension $d\geq 2$) is a reference domain occupied by the undeformed elastic body, $u:\Omega\to\mathbb{R}^d$ is the deformation map, and W_ε is a (non-convex) "stored-energy" density that describes the elastic properties of a two-material composite. In the present work, ε is a small positive parameter that represents the length-scale of the material heterogeneity (*i.e.* the period of the composite) as well as the contrast in the elastic properties of the two material components. We consider geometrically non-linear materials and assume that both materials are stress-free in the reference configuration. More precisely, we consider stored-energy densities that are frame-indifferent and have a single energy well at SO(d) with quadratic growth (see Definition 2.1 for the precise list of assumptions).

We consider periodic composites consisting of a "stiff" material matrix (occupying a connected subdomain $\Omega^1_\varepsilon\subset\Omega$) and ε-periodically distributed "soft" inclusions (occupying the set $\Omega^0_\varepsilon=\Omega\setminus\Omega^1_\varepsilon$, which is assumed to be disconnected). We suppose that on a given part $\Gamma\subset\partial\Omega$ of the specimen boundary the elastic body is clamped, *i.e.* $u(x)=x$, and that in its interior the elastic body is subjected to a body force. We are interested in the situation where the force density is small relative to the strength of the stiff material, so that on the stiff component Ω^1_ε the deformation is close to the identity map. However, due to the high contrast between the two materials, large strains may still occur on the soft component. The goal of this paper is to derive rigorously an effective model describing the overall behaviour of such a composite on the macroscopic scale. Our approach is based on the idea of "splitting" the behaviour of the displacement gradients on the soft and stiff components, deriving *a priori* estimates for these gradients, and rescaling them appropriately.

To make this precise, suppose that the stored-energy density of the composite is of the form

$$W_\varepsilon(x,F):=W_0(F)\chi^0_\varepsilon(x)+\varepsilon^{-2\gamma}W_1(F)\chi^1_\varepsilon(x),$$

where χ^0_ε and W_0 (resp. χ^1_ε and W_1) are the ε-periodic set indicator function and the stored-energy density of the "soft" (resp. "stiff") component (so that $\chi^0_\varepsilon+\chi^1_\varepsilon=1$), and $\gamma>0$ is a parameter that measures the contrast between the materials occupying the two components. Thus, W_ε represents a high-contrast version of the "classical" stored-energy function $(x,F)\mapsto W_0(F)\chi^0_\varepsilon(x)+W_1(F)\chi^1_\varepsilon(x)$. We study the asymptotic behaviour as $\varepsilon\to 0$ of the energy

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(u):=\int_\Omega\Bigl(W_\varepsilon(x,\nabla u)-l_\varepsilon\cdot\bigl(u(x)-x\bigr)\Bigr)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{1.1}$$

subject to the boundary condition $u(x) = x$ on Γ. As a main assumption, we suppose that the loads $(l_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)^d \setminus \{0\}$ satisfy the following "smallness" condition:

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lambda_\varepsilon < \infty, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \lambda_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^\gamma ||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon ||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}. \tag{1.2}$$

As part of our main result we prove that elements of minimising sequences (u_ε) for $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ admit a representation in the form

$$u_\varepsilon(x) = x + \lambda_\varepsilon(\varepsilon g^0_\varepsilon(x) + \varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon(x)) \qquad \text{with} \qquad (g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon) \times H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega),$$

where $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega) : u|_\Gamma = 0\}$ and $H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ denotes the closure in $H^1(\Omega)$ of smooth functions with support in Ω^0_ε. The pair $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ is interpreted as a "splitting" of the displacement $u_\varepsilon - \mathrm{id}$ where the *soft-part contribution* g^0_ε and *stiff-part contribution* g^1_ε are scaled differently, according to the scaling of the contrast. The heart of our analysis is an *a priori* estimate (see Theorem 3.4). It is based on a geometric rigidity estimate for perforated domains (see Proposition 5.2), which is a specially adapted version of the geometric rigidity estimate derived in the work [23] by Friesecke, James and Müller. Our *a priori* estimate shows that the sequences (g^0_ε), $(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)$, (g^1_ε) and (∇g^1_ε) are bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$. As a consequence, we have, up to a subsequence, the weak two-scale convergence

$$g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} g^0(x,y), \qquad \varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y g^0(x,y), \qquad \nabla g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y),$$

where $g^0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0))$, $g^1 \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ and $\psi \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y))$. Here $Y := [0,1)^d$, the set $Y_0 \subset Y$ represents the soft component, and $H^1_\#(Y)$ is the Sobolev space of periodic H^1-functions. The main result of the present paper is that the limit (g^0, g^1) is naturally related to a functional of the form

$$\Lambda(g^0, g^1) - \int_{\Omega\times Y} l \cdot (g^0 + g^1)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y, \tag{1.3}$$

where Λ is a "homogenised" energy, which we rigorously derive from Λ_ε in the spirit of two-scale Γ-convergence. We can extract certain information on the precise form of the expansion (1) from the minimisers of (1.3). The quality of this information and the functional Λ itself depend on the scaling properties of the applied load l_ε. In particular, we distinguish the cases

$$\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_\varepsilon \to 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

We first discuss the regime $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$. In this case the behaviour of both components is shown to be accurately captured by the linearisation of the stored-energy densities: we have (Theorem 4.3)

$$\Lambda(g^0, g^1) = \Lambda^{\mathrm{small}}(g^0, g^1) := \int_\Omega \left(\int_{Y_0} Q_0\Big(\nabla_y g^0(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}y + Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}\Big(\nabla g^1(x)\Big) \right) \mathrm{d}x.$$

Here Q_i denotes the quadratic form from the expansion of W_i at the identity, $i = 0, 1$; further, Q_1^{hom} is the result of "perforated" homogenisation of Q_1. By appealing to the convexity of the limit problem, we show that the splittings $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ associated to minimising sequences are *strongly* two-scale convergent to the minimiser of the limit problem, say (g^0_*, g^1_*). Broadly speaking, this means that *any* minimising sequence can be approximated by the expansion

$$u_\varepsilon \sim x + \lambda_\varepsilon \Big(\varepsilon g^0_*(x, x/\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^\gamma (g^1_*(x) + \varepsilon\psi_*) \Big) \tag{1.4}$$

with a corrector ψ_* that is determined by the cell problem associated to Q_1^{hom} (Proposition 4.4).

In the regime $\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$ only the material behaviour on the stiff component is linearised and Λ takes the form

$$\Lambda(g^0, g^1) = \Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(g^0, g^1) := \int_\Omega \left(\int_{Y_0} W_0\Big(I + \nabla_y g^0(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}y + Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}\Big(\nabla g^1(x)\Big) \right) \mathrm{d}x.$$

In this case our result is weaker: we prove that *there exists* a minimising sequence v_ε for $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ such that

$$v_\varepsilon(x) = x + \lambda_\varepsilon\Big(\varepsilon g_*^0(x, x/\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^\gamma(g_*^1(x) + \varepsilon\psi_*)\Big). \tag{1.5}$$

Due to the non-convexity of the stored-energy density, we expect that a general minimising sequence may oscillate on scales larger than ε and therefore cannot be captured by the two-scale ansatz above. However, we prove the convergence of the sequence of infima of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon$ to the minimum of the limit problem (Theorem 4.7).

In the rigorous formulation and the proof of the above results we use a number of mathematical tools that have been developed in the last two decades in the areas of calculus of variations and homogenisation. Among these are the two-scale convergence introduced in [32], [1]) and the periodic unfolding (see [17] and references therein), the basic information about which is given in Appendix A. These provide an appropriate vehicle for the description of the two-scale structure of low-energy sequences in our setup, which at the heuristic level is represented by the expansions (1.4) and (1.5). Further, in order to formulate a suitable two-scale compactness principle for such sequences (see Proposition 3.10 below), we make use of an extension theorem for periodic perforated domains (see [33], [7]) in combination with a geometric rigidity statement (see [23]). Finally, we exploit substantially the mathematical framework of Γ-convergence (see [19] and references therein), which allows us to formulate a rigorous statement about the convergence of (rescaled) energies, see Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.5.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we list our assumptions on the material law and the geometry of the composite microstructure. In Section 3 we introduce a scaled *splitting* of the displacement that is adapted to the composite geometry and to the contrast in the elastic stiffnesses of the two components. Further, we establish an *a priori* estimate for the splitting. In Section 3.3 we prove weak two-scale compactness for low-energy sequences, identify the corresponding limits and present an approximation scheme for the limits. Section 4 is concerned with the Γ-convergence analysis, where the regimes $\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$ and $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$ are considered separately. Finally, in Section 5 we present our adaptation of the geometric rigidity estimate to perforated domains. Some relevant facts about two-scale convergence and some auxiliary results are reviewed in the Appendix.

We use the following notation (see Section 2 for the details):

- $d \geq 2$ is the dimension;
- $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an open, bounded, connected Lipschitz domain;
- ε is a small positive parameter equal to the period of the composite;
- Ω_ε^0 (resp. Ω_ε^1) is the soft (resp. stiff) component; χ_ε^0 (resp. χ_ε^1) is the associated indicator function;
- $Y := [0,1)^d$ denotes the reference cell of periodicity; $Y_0 \subset\subset Y$ represents the (re-scaled) soft component; $Y_1 := Y \setminus Y_0$ represents the (re-scaled) stiff component; χ^i is the indicator function for Y_i, $i = 0, 1$;
- $L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $H^1_0(Y_0;\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the usual function spaces of vector valued, p-summable functions, square-summable Sobolev functions, the closure in $H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ of functions from $C^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ vanishing in a neighbourhood of $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$ and the closure of $C^1_0(Y_0;\mathbb{R}^d)$ in $H^1(Y_0;\mathbb{R}^d)$, respectively; $H^1_\#(Y;\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the space of Y-periodic maps in $H^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d;\mathbb{R}^d)$. The function spaces $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$ are defined in Definition 3.1 and in (3.18) below. If it is clear from the context we drop the target space and sometimes even the domain of definition in the notation, *e.g.* we write $L^2(\Omega)$ or even L^2 for $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^d)$ as well as for $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^{d\times d})$;
- We write $\rightharpoonup$ and $\to$ for the weak and strong convergence in a Banach space. We write $\stackrel{2}{\rightharpoonup}$ and $\stackrel{2}{\to}$ for the weak and strong two-scale convergence (see Definition A.3), and we write $\stackrel{\text{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup}$ and $\stackrel{\text{sp2}}{\to}$ for the weak and strong two-scale convergence in the "splitting" sense, as introduced in Definition 3.8;

- We write $f(h) = O(h^\alpha)$ whenever $\limsup_{h\to 0} h^{-\alpha}|f(h)| < \infty$, and $f(h) = o(h^\alpha)$ whenever $\lim_{h\to 0} h^{-\alpha}|f(h)| = 0$;
- For real $(d\times d)$-matrices $F = (F_{ij})$ and $G = (G_{ij})$ we write $F : G := F_{ij}G_{ij}$ for their inner product, $\operatorname{sym} F := (F^\top + F)/2$ for the symmetric part and $\operatorname{skw} F := F - \operatorname{sym} F$ for the skew symmetric part of F; further, we denote by $\mathrm{SO}(d)$ the set of rotations in $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- Unless stated otherwise, we write C for a generic positive constant which is independent of ε but can change its value even within a single chain of inequalities.

2 Setting of the problem

We first introduce our geometric assumptions on the sets occupied by the soft and stiff materials. Recall that in a reference configuration the composite occupies a domain Ω, which is assumed to be an open, bounded, connected set in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, with Lipschitz boundary. In order to describe the microstructure of the composite, denote by $Y := [0,1)^d$ the unit cell of periodicity and suppose that $Y_0 \subset Y$ is an open set with Lipschitz boundary. We assume that Y_0 is compactly contained in Y, *i.e.* $\operatorname{dist}(Y_0, \partial Y) > 0$, and set $Y_1 := Y \setminus Y_0$. Next, for $\varepsilon > 0$ we decompose Ω into a "stiff" matrix Ω^1_ε and "soft" inclusions Ω^0_ε, as follows:

$$\Omega^0_\varepsilon := \bigcup \left\{ \varepsilon(\xi + Y_0) \,:\, \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d,\, \varepsilon(\xi + \overline{Y}) \subset \Omega \right\}, \qquad \Omega^1_\varepsilon := \Omega \setminus \Omega^0_\varepsilon.$$

By definition Ω^1_ε is *connected* and $\partial\Omega^1_\varepsilon \setminus \partial\Omega^0_\varepsilon = \partial\Omega$ for all ε. Furthermore, Ω^0_ε is a *disconnected* set consisting of small inclusions of size $\sim \varepsilon$. Note that the soft inclusions are εY-periodically distributed in the interior of Ω and that they have a "safety distance" to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, *i.e.* if a cell $\varepsilon(\xi + \overline{Y})$ intersects $\partial\Omega$, then $\varepsilon(\xi + Y) \cap \Omega$ is occupied only by the stiff material. We denote by χ^i_ε the characteristic functions of the sets Ω^i_ε, $i = 0, 1$.

For given parameter values $\varepsilon > 0$, $\gamma > 0$ and a load $l_\varepsilon \in L^2(\Omega)^d$, let the integral functional $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon : H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by (1.1). As is mentioned in the introduction, the parameter γ measures the contrast between the soft and stiff component, and ε is a small parameter that determines the period of the composite. In the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ we expect the energy to be (partially) linearised; therefore, it is convenient to rewrite the elastic energy part of $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(u)$ as a function of the displacement $\varphi(x) := u(x) - x$:

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) := \int_\Omega \Big(W_0(I + \nabla\varphi)\chi^0_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{-2\gamma} W_1(I + \nabla\varphi)\chi^1_\varepsilon \Big)\, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Clearly, with this convention we have

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(\mathrm{id} + \varphi) = \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

where $\mathrm{id}(x) := x$ denotes the identity map in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We are interested in the asymptotic behaviour of Λ_ε along low-energy sequences of displacements that satisfy the clamped boundary condition on some part of the specimen boundary. More precisely, let Γ be a measurable subset of $\partial\Omega$ with a positive $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure. In what follows we set

$$W^{1,\infty}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega) := \{ \varphi \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega) \,:\, \varphi|_\Gamma = 0 \}.$$

To avoid technical difficulties we assume throughout the article that Γ is regular enough, so that $W^{1,\infty}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ is dense in $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$. The boundary condition for the deformation u and the displacement φ then reads

$$u - \mathrm{id} = \varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega).$$

Unless stated otherwise, (ε) denotes an arbitrary, but fixed vanishing sequence of positive numbers $(\varepsilon_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$. Quantities (g_ε) indexed ε are understood as sequences of the form $(g_{\varepsilon_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$; in the same spirit ε denotes a generic element ε_j of the sequence (ε_j). Since the convergence results and estimates are independent of the specific choice of the vanishing sequence (ε_j), they are generalised in a straightforward way to the setting with a continuous parameter ε.

Next we list our assumptions on the material law. In addition to the usual properties assumed in finite elasticity (such as frame-indifference, growth and regularity), we require that both materials be stress-free in the reference configuration (*i.e.* the reference configuration is a "natural state"). Unless stated otherwise we assume that both energy densities W_0 and W_1 belong to the class $\mathcal{W}_\theta$, $\theta > 0$, as defined below.

Definition 2.1. *The class* $\mathcal{W}_\theta$, $\theta > 0$, *consists of all continuous maps* $W : \mathbb{R}^{d\times d} \to [0, \infty)$ *with the following properties:*

- W *is frame-indifferent, i.e.* $W(RF) = W(F)$ *for any* $R \in \mathrm{SO}(d)$ *and any* $F \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$;
- I *is a natural state, i.e.* $W(I) = \min W = 0$;
- W *is non-degenerate, i.e. for any* $F \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$
$$W(F) \geq \theta \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(d));$$
- W *admits a quadratic expansion at the identity, i.e. there exists a non-negative quadratic form* Q *on* $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ *such that*
$$W(I + G) = Q(G) + r(G) \tag{2.6}$$
for any $G \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, *where*
$$r(G) = o(|G|^2) \quad \text{as} \quad |G| \to 0.$$

Remark 2.2. *Let* W *be of class* $\mathcal{W}_\theta$ *and let* Q *be the associated quadratic form. Then* Q *vanishes for skew-symmetric matrices and is positive definite (with a constant that only depends on d and* θ*) on the subspace of symmetric matrices. Thus the integral* $\int_\Omega Q(\nabla\varphi)\,\mathrm{d}x$ *is interpreted as the elastic energy of the displacement* $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ *in the framework of linearised elasticity.*

Remark 2.3. *For the a priori estimates that we derive in Section 3 the expansion condition* (2.6) *can be dropped. In order to simplify some reasoning for the regime* $\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$ *we additionally assume in Section 4.3 that* W_0 *has quadratic growth at infinity and is quasiconvex.*

Remark 2.4. *Under the requirement of material frame-indifference, i.e.* $W(RF) = W(F)$ *for any* $(d \times d)$*-matrix* F, *such that* $\det F > 0$, *and any rotation* R, *we have* $W(F) = \widetilde{W}(F^\top F)$ *for some function* $\widetilde{W}$, *and the first Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor* T *at a point where* $\nabla u = F$ *is given by* $T(F) = \nabla W(F) = 2F\nabla\widetilde{W}(F^\top F)$.

Remark 2.5. *Suppose that* $W : \mathbb{R}^{d\times d} \to [0, \infty)$ *is frame-indifferent, non-degenerate, stress-free at the identity* I *and of class* C^2 *in some neighbourhood of* I. *Then* W *is of class* $\mathcal{W}_\theta$ *and one has* $Q(G) = D^2W(I)(G, G)/2 \geq C|\operatorname{sym} G|^2$ *for some* $C > 0$.

3 An *a priori* estimate and two-scale analysis for low-energy sequences

We consider the minimisation problem for the energy

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi \,\mathrm{d}x, \quad \text{where } \varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega). \tag{3.7}$$

Throughout this section we assume that $(l_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)^d \setminus \{0\}$, and that W_i, $i = 0, 1$, are of class $\mathcal{W}_\theta$, although we need not require W_i to fulfil the "quadratic expansion" condition (2.6). The main result of this section is an *a priori* estimate for sequences with low energy. The estimate is based on a specific *splitting* (combined with a certain scaling) of the displacement φ into a contribution determined by the stiff component and the remainder. Motivated by this, we introduce in Section 3.3 several notions of two-scale convergence that are adapted to the splitting, prove a two-scale compactness result and identify the admissible limits. Furthermore, we present an approximation scheme for the admissible two-scale limits. Let us remark that the Γ-convergence analysis in Section 4 strongly relies on the two-scale results derived in the present section.

3.1 A note on the natural scaling of "near-minimising" sequences

Let us briefly describe the main idea behind the analysis to follow in Sections 3 and 4. The homogenisation and asymptotic analysis of (3.7) is carried out in the framework of Γ-convergence introduced by De Giorgi (see [18, 19]). In order to obtain relevant information about the asymptotic behaviour of (3.7) by this approach, it is mandatory to carefully select a "natural" notion of convergence for the underlying deformation fields. As in [20], the right object to study are displacements rescaled in a way that is adapted to the energy functional. However, since we treat composites with high contrast, the right choice of the scaling is not obvious. As we describe below, our choice is naturally motivated by an *a priori* estimate of the displacements $\varphi_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon - \mathrm{id}$ and a splitting of φ_ε adapted to the geometry of the composite.

We next give a rough idea of how the *a priori* estimate mentioned above is obtained. The non-degeneracy of the components directly implies

$$||\operatorname{dist}(\nabla u_\varepsilon, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^{-2\gamma}||\operatorname{dist}(\nabla u_\varepsilon, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \leq C\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon).$$

Since $\gamma > 0$, the second term on the left-hand side is of leading order as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Thus, we deduce that the behaviour of ∇u_ε on the stiff component is dominant. Furthermore, we find that ∇u_ε is close to $\mathrm{SO}(d)$ on the stiff component, as can be quantified by using a version of the geometric rigidity estimate of [23] adapted to perforated domains (see Theorem 5.1). In order to gain control of the contribution of ∇u_ε on the soft component, we introduce the splitting $u_\varepsilon = \mathrm{id} + \varphi_\varepsilon = \mathrm{id} + \varphi^0_\varepsilon + \varphi^1_\varepsilon$, where φ^0_ε vanishes on Ω^1_ε and φ^1_ε is harmonic in Ω^0_ε. We are going to prove that

$$||\nabla\varphi^0_\varepsilon||^2_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^{-2\gamma}||\nabla\varphi^1_\varepsilon||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon),$$

and that the linear, load-related part of the functional (3.7) is estimated as

$$\left|\int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x\right| \quad\leq\quad C\lambda_\varepsilon \left(||\nabla\varphi^0_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^{-\gamma}||\nabla\varphi^1_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)$$

where $\lambda_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\gamma||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}$. In conclusion, we obtain the *a priori* estimate

$$||\nabla\varphi^0_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon^{-\gamma}||\nabla\varphi^1_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\lambda_\varepsilon,$$

provided the sequence of displacements φ_ε satisfies

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{\lambda^2_\varepsilon}\left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x\right) < \infty.$$

In this paper we consider only the cases when λ_ε is either of order one or converges to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$. In view of the previous estimate, it is natural to consider the rescaled sequences $\lambda^{-1}_\varepsilon\varphi^0_\varepsilon$ and $\lambda^{-1}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\varphi^1_\varepsilon$. Indeed, the rescaled contribution on the stiff component, $\lambda^{-1}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\varphi^1_\varepsilon$, is of order one and entails a nontrivial limit. However for the soft component, by a improved Poincaré inequality, see Lemma 3.6, we have $||\varphi^0_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon||\nabla\varphi^0_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}$, and we deduce that $\lambda^{-1}_\varepsilon\varphi^0_\varepsilon$ converges to zero in the L^2-norm, although its contribution to the elastic energy is of the same order as that for the stiff component. For this reason we consider the scaling $\lambda^{-1}_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi^0_\varepsilon$ instead. In conclusion, we are going to show the following: as $\varepsilon \to 0$, the infima of the energy functionals (3.7) are of order λ^2_ε, the related minimising sequences can be represented as $\varphi_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon(\varepsilon g^0_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon)$, where g^0_ε vanishes on Ω^1_ε, g^1_ε is harmonic in Ω^0_ε, and the sequences g^0_ε, $\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon$, g^1_ε, ∇g^1_ε are bounded in the L^2-norm. Therefore, we consider the Γ-limit of the rescaled energy sequence $\lambda^{-2}_\varepsilon\left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x\right)$ with respect to the two-scale convergence of the sequences g^0_ε, g^1_ε. Let us point out that any other scaling either leads to a loss of compactness or to trivial limits. Hence, (for $\lambda_\varepsilon \lesssim 1$) the scaling introduced above is indeed the natural one.

3.2 The *a priori* estimate and a splitting of the displacement

Consider a sequence of displacements (φ_ε) in $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ with equi-bounded energies, *i.e.* $\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = O(1)$. Then clearly the sequence (φ_ε) is bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$. Indeed, since the stored-energy function is non-degenerate (see Definition 2.1), it satisfies a quadratic bound below. In the high-contrast situation considered in the present article, we can expect more, since the strength of the stiff component increases as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Thus, it is natural to expect that we gain additional control on the displacement gradient restricted to the stiff component Ω^1_ε. To make this precise by means of a quantitative estimate, we introduce a "splitting" of the displacement that reflects the difference in the behaviour of the soft and stiff components. Let us remark that this splitting will also play a crucial role in the asymptotic analysis of the energy Λ_ε as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Definition 3.1 (Splitting)**.** *For $\varepsilon > 0$ set $\mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(\Omega) := H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon) \times H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$. For each $\varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ there exists a unique pair $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi = \varepsilon g^0_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon \quad \textit{in } \Omega, \quad g^0_\varepsilon = 0 \textit{ in } \Omega^1_\varepsilon, \qquad \textit{and} \\ &\|\nabla g^1_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\nabla(g^1_\varepsilon + \zeta)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \qquad \textit{for all } \zeta \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

We refer to $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ as the ε-splitting of φ and write $\varphi \leftrightsquigarrow (g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$.

The splitting is well defined due to the following classical extension result for perforated domains:

Lemma 3.2. *(see e.g. [33, Theorem 4.2]). Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $g \in H^1(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)$. There exists exactly one map $\widehat{g} \in H^1(\Omega)$ with $\widehat{g} = g$ on Ω^1_ε and*

$$\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} \nabla\widehat{g} : \nabla\zeta \,\mathrm{d}x = 0 \qquad \textit{for all } \zeta \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon). \tag{3.9}$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant C independent of ε and g such that

$$\|\widehat{g}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|g\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\|\nabla\widehat{g}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|\nabla g\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\|\operatorname{sym}\nabla\widehat{g}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|\operatorname{sym}\nabla g\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}. \tag{3.12}$$

Remark 3.3. *Although property* (3.9) *is not stated in Theorem 4.2 of [33], it is implied by the proof of Lemma 4.1 of [33], which is utilised by the latter.*

By definition g^1_ε is the unique harmonic extension of $\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\varphi_\varepsilon|_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon}$ to Ω, *i.e.* the map in $H^1(\Omega)$ that satisfies $g^1_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\gamma}\varphi_\varepsilon$ in Ω^1_ε and the elliptic equation (3.9), which is the Euler-Lagrange equation associated to the minimisation problem (3.8). The important property here is that the condition allows to control the L^2-norm of the gradient of the extension by $\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\nabla\varphi$ restricted to the stiff component. Since (3.9) admits a unique solution, the splitting defined in this way is unique. Furthermore, note that the mapping $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega) \ni \varphi \mapsto (g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ is a linear bijection.

The above splitting construction is tailor-made for the following estimate.

Theorem 3.4 (*A priori* estimate)**.** *Let $\varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ and $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi$. Then*

$$\|g^0_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|g^1_\varepsilon\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \le C\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) \tag{3.13}$$

for a positive constant C that only depends on the geometry of Ω, Γ, Y_0 and the parameter θ.

We present the proof of the above theorem in Section 3.4. In a nutshell, the argument is as follows: suppose that (φ_ε) is a sequence with $\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = O(1)$. By virtue of the non-degeneracy of the stored-energy functions and due to the high contrast between the soft and stiff component, the scaled displacement gradient $\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon$ restricted to the stiff component Ω^1_ε is bounded in L^2. Then by Lemma 3.2 we conclude that $\|g^1_\varepsilon\|_{H^1(\Omega)} = O(1)$. Furthermore, by construction the difference $\varphi_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon$ (which coincides with $\varepsilon g^0_\varepsilon$) is only supported by the soft component and can be identified with a map in $H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$. Since Ω^0_ε is a union of small inclusions of size $\sim \varepsilon$, it follows (by using a suitable version of the Poincaré inequality) that $\|g^0_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = O(1)$.

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose that* (l_ε) *satisfies* (1.2) *and* (φ_ε) *is a sequence in* $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *such that*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}\left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x\right) < \infty. \tag{3.14}$$

Then

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) < \infty. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. Let $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi_\varepsilon$ and recall that $\lambda_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^\gamma ||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}$. From the definition of ε-splitting we have

$$\int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega (\varepsilon^\gamma l_\varepsilon)\cdot g^1_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} (\varepsilon l_\varepsilon)\cdot g^0_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the *a priori* estimate (3.13) and the definition of λ_ε yield

$$\left|\int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x\right| \le C\,\lambda_\varepsilon \sqrt{\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon)}. \tag{3.16}$$

For $a_\varepsilon := \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\sqrt{\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon)}$ we now have

$$a_\varepsilon^2 \le \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x\right) + \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\left|\int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x\right| \le C(1 + a_\varepsilon),$$

and (3.15) follows. □

The bound (3.14) is a *low-energy condition.* It is satisfied, in particular, if

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x \le 0, \tag{3.17}$$

when we even get the bound $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) \le C$ for any ε, where C is a positive constant which does not depend on the choice of a particular sequence (φ_ε) satisfying (3.17) and only depends on the geometry of Ω, Γ, Y_0 and the parameter θ. Furthermore, the set of sequences of displacements $\varphi_\varepsilon \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ satisfying (3.14) is non-empty: for example, the trivial displacement $\varphi_\varepsilon = 0$ fulfils the inequality (3.17).

As mentioned above, in the proof of Theorem 3.4 we need the following improved Poincaré inequality.

Lemma 3.6. *Let the sets* Ω, Ω^0_ε *and* Ω^1_ε *be as in Section 2. For all* $u \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *we have*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\big(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} + \varepsilon\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}\big).$$

where C *denotes a positive constant that only depends on the geometry of* Ω, Γ *and* Y_0.

Proof. Let $\widetilde{u}$ denote the harmonic extension of $u|_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon}$ to Ω as introduced in Lemma 3.2. Set $\zeta := \widetilde{u} - u$ and $Z_\varepsilon := \{\, \xi \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d \,:\, \xi + \varepsilon Y_0 \subset \Omega^0_\varepsilon \,\}$. By construction, ζ is supported in $\Omega^0_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{\xi\in Z_\varepsilon}(\xi + \varepsilon Y_0)$. For $\xi \in Z_\varepsilon$ and $y \in Y_0$ define $V_\xi(y) := \zeta(\xi + \varepsilon y)$. We note that $V_\xi \in H^1_0(Y_0)$ and $\nabla_y V_\xi(y) = \varepsilon\nabla\zeta(\xi + \varepsilon y)$. Therefore, re-scaling and Poincaré's inequality yield

$$\int_\Omega |\zeta|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x = \varepsilon^d \sum_{\xi\in\mathbb{Z}^\varepsilon}\int_{Y_0} |V_\xi|^2 \, \mathrm{d}y \le C\varepsilon^d \sum_{\xi\in\mathbb{Z}^\varepsilon}\int_{Y_0} |\nabla_y V_\xi|^2 \, \mathrm{d}y = C\varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} |\nabla\zeta|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

By the identity $u = \widetilde{u} + \zeta$ and Poincaré's inequality applied to $\widetilde{u}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||_{L^2(\Omega)} &\le ||\widetilde{u}||_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||\zeta||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \le C(||\nabla\widetilde{u}||_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon||\nabla\zeta||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}) \\ &= C(||\nabla\widetilde{u}||_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon(||\nabla u||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + ||\nabla\widetilde{u}||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)})). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the result follows from the estimate (3.11). □

Remark 3.7. *In high-contrast homogenisation problems one often has to work with sequences of functions whose gradients are allowed to be large on some periodic components of the domain. In this situation the standard Poincaré inequality may not be good enough to provide boundedness of* u_ε*, and one has to use its improved versions, such as* $\|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} + \|\varepsilon\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \le C$*. For further details we refer to [13], where a "high-contrast" Poincaré inequality is proved under the assumptions that* u_ε *has zero mean and* Ω^0_ε *is not required to be disconnected. Lemma 3.6 is a simplified version of this high-contrast Poincaré inequality.*

3.3 Two-scale limits of low-energy sequences

Let $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ have equi-bounded energy (*i.e.* it satisfies (3.14)) and let $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ denote the associated ε-splitting. Corollary 3.5 and the *a priori* estimate in Theorem 3.4 show that the sequences (g^0_ε), $(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)$ and (∇g^1_ε) are bounded in L^2 and therefore they are also relatively weakly two-scale compact. In this paragraph we identify the corresponding two-scale limits (see Proposition 3.10) and present a scheme that allows to approximate the admissible limits (see Proposition 3.13). These limits belong to the space on which we define the limiting homogenised functional in Section 4.

We start with the definition of the limit space and certain variants of two-scale convergence adapted to the splitting introduced in Definition 3.1; see Definition A.3 for the usual definition of two-scale convergence of functions. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y) &:= L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0)) \times H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)\\ &\quad\times \left\{ \psi \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y)) : \iint_{\Omega\times Y_0} \nabla_y\psi : \nabla_y\zeta \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y = 0 \ \text{ for all } \zeta \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0)) \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

With slight abuse of notation we write $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$ (resp. $\psi \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$), if $(g^0, g^1, 0) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$ (resp. $(0,0,\psi) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$).

Definition 3.8. *Let* (φ_ε) *be a sequence in* $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$*,* $(g^0, g^1, \psi) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$*, and let* $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ *denote the* ε*-splitting associated to* φ_ε*.*

1. *We say that a sequence* (φ_ε) *weakly two-scale converges in the splitting sense to* (g^0, g^1)*, and write* $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1)$*, if*
$$\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y g^0 \quad \textit{in } L^2(\Omega\times Y), \qquad g^1_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup g^1 \quad \textit{weakly in } H^1(\Omega).$$

2. *We say that* (φ_ε) *weakly two-scale converges in the splitting sense to* (g^0, g^1, ψ)*, and write* $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1, \psi)$*, if* $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1)$ *and*
$$\nabla g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla g^1 + \nabla_y\psi \qquad \textit{in } L^2(\Omega\times Y).$$

3. *We say that* (φ_ε) *strongly two-scale converges in the splitting sense to* (g^0, g^1)*, and write* $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1)$*, if* $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1)$ *and* $\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \nabla_y g^0$ *in* $L^2(\Omega\times Y)$*.*

4. *We say that* (φ_ε) *strongly two-scale converges in the splitting sense to* (g^0, g^1, ψ)*, and write* $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1, \psi)$*, if* $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1)$ *and*
$$\nabla g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \nabla g^1 + \nabla_y\psi \qquad \textit{in } L^2(\Omega\times Y).$$

Remark 3.9. *Our requirement of two-scale convergence of the scaled gradients* $\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon$ *in the above definition implies the two-scale convergence of* g^0_ε*, which can be seen from the Poincaré inequality. It leads, however, to an equivalent convergence statement for the functionals* $\lambda^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon$*, due to the fact that the sequence* $(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)$ *is* L^2*-bounded whenever* g^0_ε *correspond to a sequence* φ_ε *for which* $\limsup \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) < \infty$*.*

The above definition introduces a hierarchy of convergence types: In particular, the following implications hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1, \psi) \qquad &\Rightarrow \qquad \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1, \psi), \\ \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1, \psi) \qquad &\Rightarrow \qquad \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1), \\ \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1, \psi) \qquad &\Rightarrow \qquad \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1). \end{aligned}$$

The weak convergence types $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1)$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1, \psi)$ are naturally related to the energy Λ_ε by means of the following compactness result.

Proposition 3.10. *Let* $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *and suppose that* $\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) < \infty$. *Then there exists a triple* $(g^0, g^1, \psi) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$ *such that, up to a subsequence, one has* $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1, \psi)$.

Proof. Consider the ε-splitting $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon$. By Theorem 3.4 the sequences (g^0_ε), (g^1_ε), $(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)$ and (∇g^1_ε) are bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$. Thus, by Proposition A.5 there exist $(g_0, g_1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$ and $\psi \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y))$ such that

$$\begin{gathered} g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} g^0, \qquad \varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y g^0, \\ g^1_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup g^1 \quad \text{weakly in } H^1(\Omega), \qquad \nabla g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla g^1 + \nabla_y\psi, \end{gathered}$$

for a subsequence that we do not relabel. It remains to show that the function ψ satisfies the integral identity

$$\iint_{\Omega\times Y_0} \nabla_y\psi(x,y) : \nabla_y\zeta(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \zeta \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0)). \tag{3.19}$$

By invoking a density argument it is sufficient to take smooth test functions in (3.19), *i.e.* $\zeta \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(\Omega; C^1_0(Y_0))$. Set $\zeta_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon\zeta(x, x/\varepsilon)$ where ζ is extended in its second variable by zero to Y and the resulting function is extended by Y-periodicity to $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then clearly, $\zeta_\varepsilon \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ for small enough ε and $\nabla\zeta_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \nabla_y\zeta$ in $L^2(\Omega\times Y)$. Thus,

$$\int_\Omega \nabla g^1_\varepsilon : \nabla\zeta_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x \to \iint_{\Omega\times Y} \Big(\nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y)\Big) : \nabla_y\zeta(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. By (3.9) the left-hand side of (3.3) is zero, hence it suffices to notice that

$$\iint_{\Omega\times Y} \nabla g^1(x) : \nabla_y\zeta(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y = \int_\Omega \nabla g^1(x) : \int_Y \nabla_y\zeta(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$$

in view of the fact that $\zeta(x,\cdot) \in H^1_0(Y_0) \subset H^1_0(Y)$ and hence $\int_Y \nabla_y\zeta(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}y = 0$. ☐

The limit (g^0, g^1) captures the relevant behaviour of (φ_ε) as $\varepsilon \to 0$. In particular, the map g^0 resolves as a two-scale limit oscillations that might emerge in the soft component. We are going to show in Section 4 that the limiting behaviour of the energy $\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon)$ can be described as a function of (g^0, g^1). By combining Corollary 3.5 and Proposition 3.10 we arrive at the following statement

Corollary 3.11. *Let* $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *be such that (3.14) holds, where* λ_ε, l_ε *satisfy the condition (1.2) on the applied load. Then, up to a subsequence,* $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1)$ *for some* $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$.

It might seem that the limit (g^0, g^1) of a sequence $(\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon)$ depends on the definition of the ε-splitting $(g^1_\varepsilon, g^0_\varepsilon)$ associated to $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon$. That is if we allow a certain degree of freedom in the splitting construction, namely in the way of extending $\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon|_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon}$ to Ω, but still requiring (3.10)–(3.12). The next corollary shows that (g^0, g^1) is in fact independent of the specific construction and can be recovered from φ_ε directly.

Corollary 3.12. *Under the conditions of Proposition 3.10 one has, up to a subsequence:*

$$\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon^1 \rightharpoonup |Y_1|g^1 \quad \text{in} \ \ L^2(\Omega), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y g^0.$$

Proof. Let $(g_\varepsilon^0, g_\varepsilon^1) \leftrightsquigarrow \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon$. For the first convergence we use the fact that, up to a subsequence, $g_\varepsilon^1 \to g^1$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ and $\chi_\varepsilon^1 \rightharpoonup |Y_1|$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$. The second convergence follows directly from Proposition 3.10 by recalling that $\varepsilon^\gamma = o(1)$. ☐

Note that the above corollary fully identifies the map g^0 as well as g^1 : indeed, suppose that g^0 and $\tilde{g}^0$ in $L^2(\Omega; H_0^1(Y_0))$ satisfy $\nabla_y g^0 = \nabla_y \tilde{g}^0$. Since $g^0 = \tilde{g}^0$ on $\Omega\times\partial Y_0$, the Poincaré inequality then immediately yields $g^0 = \tilde{g}^0$.

Finally, we present an approximation scheme for $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$ that will be used in Section 4 for the construction of recovery sequences in the small-load regime.

Proposition 3.13. *Let $(g^0, g^1, \psi) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$, and let (c_ε) be an arbitrary vanishing sequence of positive numbers converging to zero. Then there exists a sequence (φ_ε) in $H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\text{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1, \psi), \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} c_\varepsilon ||\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

The proposition shows that any pair $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$ can be approximated by a sequence of displacements $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ with respect to a convergence notion that is even stronger than the one introduced in Definition 3.8. We would like to remark that the second condition in (3.20) is a technical property that is tailor-made for the linearisation of the stored-energy density, which will be at the centre of the argument of Section 4. Furthermore, in the proof of Proposition 4.4 we need the following continuity result:

Lemma 3.14. *Let $3/2 < p \le 2$ and (η_ε) be a sequence in $H^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\|\eta_\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_1^\varepsilon)} \to 0, \tag{3.21}$$

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon^0} \nabla\eta_\varepsilon : \nabla\zeta \, \mathrm{d}x = 0 \quad \text{for all } \zeta \in H_0^1(\Omega_\varepsilon^0). \tag{3.22}$$

Then (η_ε) strongly converges to zero in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.13. Recall that $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\text{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1)$ means

$$g_\varepsilon^0 \overset{2}{\to} g^0 \qquad \text{in } L^2(\Omega\times Y), \qquad \varepsilon\nabla g_\varepsilon^0 \overset{2}{\to} \nabla_y g^0 \qquad \text{in } L^2(\Omega\times Y), \tag{3.23}$$

$$g_\varepsilon^1 \rightharpoonup g^1 \qquad \text{weakly in } H^1(\Omega), \qquad \nabla g_\varepsilon^1 \overset{2}{\to} \nabla g^1 + \nabla_y\psi \qquad \text{in } L^2(\Omega\times Y), \tag{3.24}$$

where $(g_\varepsilon^0, g_\varepsilon^1) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi_\varepsilon$. The proof of the proposition is divided into three steps. First, we present a construction for limits (g^0, g^1, ψ) that are subject to additional regularity assumptions. This yields a sequence $\varphi_\varepsilon = \varepsilon\widetilde{g}_\varepsilon^0 + \varepsilon^\gamma\widetilde{g}_\varepsilon^1$, where $\widetilde{g}_\varepsilon^1$ does not necessarily satisfy (3.8). Next, we extend the construction to general limits using a diagonalisation argument. Finally, we argue *a posteriori* that the associated ε-splitting satisfies (3.23) and (3.24).

Step 1 (Construction for L^∞-data). First, we present a construction for uniformly bounded limits. Suppose that

$$g^0 \in C_c^1(\Omega\times Y_0), \quad g^1 \in W^{1,\infty}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega), \quad \text{and} \quad \psi \in C_c^1(\Omega; C^1_\#(Y)). \tag{3.25}$$

Recall that $\{x\} \in Y$ denotes the unique vector such that $x = [x] + \{x\}$ for some $[x] \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ (see Appendix A). Define

$$\widetilde{g}_\varepsilon^0(x) := g^0(x, \{x/\varepsilon\}), \qquad \widetilde{g}_\varepsilon^1(x) := g^1(x) + \varepsilon\psi(x, x/\varepsilon), \qquad \varphi_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon\widetilde{g}_\varepsilon^0(x) + \varepsilon^\gamma\widetilde{g}_\varepsilon^1(x). \tag{3.26}$$

By construction we have $\widetilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon, \varphi_\varepsilon \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$; and if $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, there holds $\widetilde{g}^0_\varepsilon \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$. Furthermore, (3.23) –(3.24) are fulfilled with $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ replaced by $(\widetilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon)$.

Step 2 (Diagonal sequence construction). Next we approximate general limits by employing a diagonal sequence construction. Let (g^0, g^1, ψ) be as in the statement of the proposition. By a density argument for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find maps (g^0_k, g^1_k, ψ_k) that satisfy (3.25) and approximate (g^0, g^1, ψ) so that

$$||g^0 - g^0_k||_{L^2(\Omega;H^1(Y_0))} + ||g^1 - g^1_k||_{H^1(\Omega)} + ||\psi - \psi_k||_{L^2(\Omega;H^1(Y))} \leq \frac{1}{k}.$$

Let $(\widetilde{g}^0_{k,\varepsilon})$, $(\widetilde{g}^0_{k,\varepsilon})$ and $(\varphi_{k,\varepsilon})$ be the approximations associated to (g^0_k, g^1_k, ψ_k) by the construction (3.26). Define

$$\begin{aligned} c_{k,\varepsilon} := ||\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\widetilde{g}^0_{k,\varepsilon}) - g^0||_{L^2} + ||\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\widetilde{g}^0_{k,\varepsilon}) - \nabla_y g^0||_{L^2} \\ + ||\widetilde{g}^1_{k,\varepsilon} - g^1||_{L^2} + ||\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla\widetilde{g}^1_{k,\varepsilon}) - (\nabla g^1 + \nabla_y\psi)||_{L^2} + c_\varepsilon||\nabla\varphi_{k,\varepsilon}||_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$ denotes the unfolding operator (see Appendix A) and $L^2 = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times Y)$. (Note that we tacitly extend the maps defined on $\Omega\times Y$ to $\mathbb{R}^d\times Y$ by zero.) It follows from Step 1 that the unfolded quantities in the definition of $c_{k,\varepsilon}$ strongly converge as $\varepsilon \to 0$, hence

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to0} c_{k,\varepsilon} \leq ||g^0_k - g^0||_{L^2} + ||\nabla_y g^0_k - \nabla_y g^0||_{L^2} + ||g^1_k - g^1||_{L^2} + ||(\nabla g^1_k + \nabla_y\psi_k) - (\nabla g^1 + \nabla_y\psi)||_{L^2} \leq \frac{2}{k}.$$

Hence, $\lim_{k\to\infty}\lim_{\varepsilon\to0} c_{k,\varepsilon} = 0$. Now, an argument from [2] (see Lemma A.6) yields a diagonal sequence $(k_\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_\varepsilon \to \infty$ and $c_{k_\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. As a consequence, the sequences defined by $\widetilde{g}^0_\varepsilon := \widetilde{g}^0_{k_\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$, $\widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon := \widetilde{g}^1_{k_\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ and $\varphi_\varepsilon := \varphi_{k_\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ satisfy (3.23)–(3.24) with $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ replaced by $(\widetilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon)$.

Step 3 (Convergence of the ε-splitting). Let $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi_\varepsilon$. Note that in general $(\widetilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon)$ might differ from $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$, since $\widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon$ is not necessarily harmonic in Ω^0_ε. Thus, we have to argue that the pair $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ satisfies (3.23)–(3.24). Setting $\eta_\varepsilon := g^1_\varepsilon - \widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon$, it clearly suffices to prove that

$$||\eta_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} = O(\varepsilon), \qquad \nabla\eta_\varepsilon \to 0 \qquad \text{strongly in } L^2(\Omega).$$

This can be seen as follows. Since $\widetilde{g}^0_\varepsilon$ vanishes on the stiff component Ω^1_ε, we have $\eta_\varepsilon \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$. By appealing to the definition of g^1_ε we find that (*cf.* (3.9))

$$0 = \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} \nabla g^1_\varepsilon : \nabla\zeta \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} \nabla(\widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon + \eta_\varepsilon) : \nabla\zeta \,\mathrm{d}x \qquad \text{for all } \zeta \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon). \tag{3.27}$$

Hence, η_ε is the unique solution of (3.27) in $H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$. Since $(\nabla\widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon)$ is bounded, taking $\zeta = \eta_\varepsilon$ in (3.27) shows that the sequence (η_ε) is bounded in $H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$. Therefore, by Proposition A.5 we get $||\eta_\varepsilon||_{L^2} = O(\varepsilon)$ and, up to a subsequence, $\nabla\eta_\varepsilon \xrightharpoonup{2} \nabla_y\eta_0$ in $L^2(\Omega\times Y)$ for some $\eta_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0))$. By the periodic unfolding of the integral in the right-hand-side of (3.27) (see Proposition A.4) and a rearrangement of the terms in the resulting equality we get

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla\eta_\varepsilon|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times Y} \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla\eta_\varepsilon) : \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla\eta_\varepsilon) \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y = -\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times Y} \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla\widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon) : \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla\eta_\varepsilon) \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Since the sequence $(\nabla\widetilde{g}^1_\varepsilon)$ (resp. $(\nabla\eta_\varepsilon)$) strongly (resp. weakly) two-scale converges, passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the right-hand side of (3.3) yields

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0} \int_\Omega |\nabla\eta_\varepsilon|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = -\iint_{\Omega\times Y} (\nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y)) : \nabla_y\eta_0(x,y) \,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Since $\eta_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0))$, $\nabla g(x)$ is constant with respect to y, and because ψ satisfies (3.9) (resp. (3.8)), the right-hand side of (3.3) vanishes, which means that $\nabla\eta_\varepsilon$ strongly converges to zero in $L^2(\Omega)$, as claimed. □

Proof of Lemma 3.14. Recall that we denote by C a positive generic constant that can be chosen independent of ε. Since ∂Y_0 is a Lipschitz boundary, there exists a family (E_ε) of continuous extension operators E_ε from $W^{1,p}(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)$ to $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\forall \eta \in W^{1,p}(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)\ : \qquad ||\nabla(E_\varepsilon \eta)||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C||\nabla \eta||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \tag{3.28}$$

(see *e.g.* [7, Appendix B]). Set $\eta^*_\varepsilon := E_\varepsilon(\eta_\varepsilon|_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon})$ and $v_\varepsilon := \eta_\varepsilon - \eta^*_\varepsilon$. By construction we have $v_\varepsilon \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$, and by assumption (3.21) and property (3.28) we have $\nabla \eta^*_\varepsilon \to 0$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. Furthermore, by (3.22) we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla v_\varepsilon\ :\ \nabla \zeta\,\mathrm{d}x = -\int_\Omega \nabla \eta^*_\varepsilon\ :\ \nabla \zeta\,\mathrm{d}x \qquad \text{for all } \zeta \in W^{1,\infty}_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon). \tag{3.29}$$

Thus, v_ε is the unique solution in $W^{1,p}_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ to a non-homogeneous Dirichlet problem with the right-hand side $-\Delta \eta^*_\varepsilon$ understood in the sense of distributions. By elliptic regularity we expect the *a priori* estimate

$$||v_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \leq C||\nabla \eta^*_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \tag{3.30}$$

to hold. Since $||\nabla \eta^*_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \to 0$ this would complete the proof. For the precise argument we rescale v_ε to domains independent of ε and consider the components of the vector-valued map v_ε separately. Therefore, let $i \in \{1,\dots,d\}$ be arbitrary and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the maps

$$V^\xi_\varepsilon\ :\ Y_0 \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad V^\xi_\varepsilon(y) := \begin{cases} \varepsilon^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon v^i_\varepsilon)(\xi,y) & \text{if } \varepsilon(\xi + Y_0) \subset \Omega^0_\varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

$$F^\xi_\varepsilon\ :\ Y_0 \to \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad F^\xi_\varepsilon(y) := \begin{cases} (\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \nabla(\eta^*_\varepsilon)^i)(\xi,y) & \text{if } \varepsilon(\xi + Y_0) \subset \Omega^0_\varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

where v^i_ε and $(\eta^*_\varepsilon)^i$ denote the ith component of the corresponding vector. It is straightforward to check that

$$||\nabla v^i_\varepsilon||^p_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} = \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} ||\nabla V^\xi_\varepsilon||^p_{L^p(Y_0)}, \qquad ||\nabla(\eta^*_\varepsilon)^i||^p_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} = \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d} ||F^\xi_\varepsilon||^p_{L^p(Y_0)}. \tag{3.31}$$

Furthermore, by (3.29) for all $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the function V^ξ_ε is the unique weak solution in $W^{1,p}_0(Y_0)$ to the non-homogeneous Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta V^\xi_\varepsilon &= \nabla \cdot F^\xi_\varepsilon && \text{in } Y_0, \\ V^\xi_\varepsilon &= 0 && \text{on } \partial Y_0. \end{aligned}$$

By elliptic regularity we get the *a priori* estimate

$$||V^\xi_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(Y_0)} \leq C||F^\xi_\varepsilon||_{L^p(Y_0)} \qquad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

as is shown in [25, Theorem 0.5]. By virtue of (3.31) this implies (3.30), and the proof is complete. ☐

3.4 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Recall that $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi$ and set $\varphi^1_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon$ and $\varphi^0_\varepsilon := \varepsilon g^0_\varepsilon$; note that the deformation associated to φ takes the form

$$u = \mathrm{id} + \varphi = \mathrm{id} + \varphi^0_\varepsilon + \varphi^1_\varepsilon = \mathrm{id} + \varepsilon g^0_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon.$$

Let us denote by $\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon$ the extension of $u\big|_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon}$ to Ω as given in Proposition 5.2. We have

$$\|\mathrm{dist}(\nabla \widetilde{u}_\varepsilon, \mathrm{SO}(n))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\, \|\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}\,.$$

By assumption we have $u = \mathrm{id}$ on $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega \subset \partial\Omega^1_\varepsilon$, hence $\widetilde{u}_\varepsilon = \mathrm{id}$ on Γ, and so the geometric rigidity estimate from Proposition 5.4 yields

$$||\nabla \widetilde{u}_\varepsilon - I||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\, \|\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}\,.$$

By construction it is $\varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon = \varphi^1_\varepsilon = \widetilde{u}_\varepsilon - \mathrm{id}$, thus

$$||\nabla \varphi^1_\varepsilon||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C|| \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}. \tag{3.32}$$

We proceed now with φ^0_ε, and start with the pointwise inequality

$$\mathrm{dist}(\nabla(u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon), \mathrm{SO}(d)) \leq \mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d)) + |\nabla \varphi^1_\varepsilon|, \tag{3.33}$$

which is obtained as follows. Fix $x \in \Omega$ and choose rotations R_1 and R_2 in such a way that $\mathrm{dist}(\nabla(u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon), \mathrm{SO}(d)) = |\nabla(u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon) - R_1|$ and $\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d)) = |\nabla u - R_2|$. Then by the triangle inequality one has

$$|\nabla(u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon) - R_1| \leq |\nabla(u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon) - R_2| \leq |\nabla u - R_2| + |\nabla \varphi^1_\varepsilon|,$$

which is exactly (3.33). From Proposition 5.4 (recall that $u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon = \mathrm{id}$ on the boundary of Ω^0_ε), applied via a scaling argument as in Proposition 5.2, and by the estimates (3.33) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla \varphi^0_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} = \|\nabla(u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon) - I\|_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} &\leq C\| \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla(u - \varphi^1_\varepsilon), \mathrm{SO}(d))\|_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq C\| \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))\|_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + C\|\nabla \varphi^1_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then via (3.32) we finally conclude that

$$||\nabla \varphi^0_\varepsilon||^2_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \leq C|| \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.34}$$

Since $\varphi^1_\varepsilon = 0$ on Γ, we get

$$||\varphi^1_\varepsilon||^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C|| \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \tag{3.35}$$

by appealing to (3.32) and to the standard Poincaré inequality. By construction the displacement φ^0_ε vanishes on $\partial\Omega^0_\varepsilon$. Thus, (3.34) and the high-contrast Poincaré inequality (see Lemma 3.6) yield

$$||\varphi^0_\varepsilon||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + ||\varepsilon \nabla \varphi^0_\varepsilon||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c\, \varepsilon^2 || \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{3.36}$$

By assumption the stored energy functions W_i, $i = 0, 1$, are of class $\mathcal{W}_\theta$. In particular, they are non-degenerate with constant $\theta > 0$; thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|| \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon^{-2\gamma} || \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \\ &\leq || \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + C\varepsilon^{-2\gamma} || \,\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))||^2_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \leq C\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi).\end{aligned}$$

Now, the statement of the theorem follows from (3.35) and (3.36). □

4 Asymptotics and Γ-convergence

In this section we study the asymptotic properties of the total energy (3.7) along sequences $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ that satisfy the low-energy condition (3.14), and for loads $(l_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)^d \setminus \{0\}$ that are relatively small in the sense of the condition (1.2). For reader's convenience we recall that this means that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lambda_\varepsilon < \infty \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\lambda^2_\varepsilon} \left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x \right) < \infty, \tag{4.37}$$

where $\lambda_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^\gamma ||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon ||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}$.

Let $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ be the ε-splitting associated to $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon$ via Definition 3.1. Using the *a priori* estimate of Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon(\varepsilon g^0_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^\gamma g^1_\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad g^0_\varepsilon, \varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon, \nabla g^2_\varepsilon \text{ are equi-bounded in } L^2(\Omega),\\
&\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = O(\lambda_\varepsilon^2), \qquad \left|\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x\right| = O(\lambda_\varepsilon^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

We obtain several pieces of information from (4.38). First, clearly

$$||\varphi_\varepsilon||_{H^1(\Omega)} = O(\lambda_\varepsilon), \qquad ||\varphi_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} = O(\lambda_\varepsilon\, \varepsilon^{\min\{\gamma,1\}});$$

and we immediately see that any low-energy sequence weakly converges to zero in $H^1(\Omega)$ (since $\gamma > 0$ by assumption). Furthermore, (4.38) indicates that different kinds of behaviour are to be expected for $\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$ and $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$, respectively.

In the regime $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$ the infimum of the total energy converges to zero. Moreover, the sequence of displacement gradients $(\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon)$ converges strongly to zero and thus the associated nonlinear strains $\sqrt{(I+\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon)^\top(I+\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon)}$ get arbitrarily close to the identity. Broadly speaking, this allows to replace the energy contributions of the soft and stiff component by their linearisations, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} W_0(I+\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x &\sim \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} Q_0(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x,\\
\varepsilon^{-2\gamma}\int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon} W_1(I+\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x &\sim \lambda_\varepsilon^2 \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon} Q_1(\nabla g^1_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

where Q_i is the quadratic term in the expansion of W_i at the identity, $i = 0, 1$. Motivated by this, in Section 4.2 we study an appropriately scaled version of the energy, which leads to non-trivial limiting behaviour described by a quadratic energy functional.

In the regime $\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$ the infimum of the total energy is of order one and large strains might emerge in the soft component, thus a full linearisation cannot be expected in this case. However, we argue in Section 4.3 that in the stiff component the nonlinear strain is still close to identity; and thus allows for a partial linearisation, in the sense that (4.39) remains valid.

4.1 Convergence of the load term

In this paragraph we establish some convergence properties of the load term. Let us first refine our assumptions on the applied load. In order to exclude concentrations we suppose that there exist limiting loads $l^1 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $l^0 \in L^2(\Omega\times Y)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&l^1_\varepsilon := \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varepsilon^\gamma l_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup l^1 &&\text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega),\\
&l^0_\varepsilon := \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varepsilon\chi^0_\varepsilon l_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2} l^0(x,y) &&\text{strongly two-scale.}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

Remark 4.1. *If the first of the assumptions* (4.37) *is satisfied, then the components* $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varepsilon^\gamma l_\varepsilon$ *and* $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varepsilon\chi^0_\varepsilon l_\varepsilon$ *are equi-bounded in* $L^2(\Omega)$. *Thus, only the assumption that the latter component of the load is strongly (rather than just weakly) two-scale convergent introduces an additional constraint. Conversely, if a sequence* $(l_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ *satisfies* (4.40) *with respect to a given bounded sequence* (λ_ε), *then* $\varepsilon^\gamma||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon||l_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \sim \lambda_\varepsilon$.

It is convenient to introduce the following notation for the load term: for $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ and $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$ we set

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) &:= \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} l^0_\varepsilon \cdot g^0_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega l^1_\varepsilon \cdot g^1_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x,\\
\mathcal{L}^0(g^0, g^1) &:= \int_\Omega \left(\int_{Y_0} l^0 \cdot g^0 \,\mathrm{d}y + l^1 \cdot g^1 \right) \mathrm{d}x.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

Clearly, we have

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}\int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x = \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \qquad \text{for } (g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon.$$

Assumption (4.40) is tailor-made for passing to the limit in $\mathcal{L}^\varepsilon$:

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $(l^0_\varepsilon), (l^1_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ *satisfy* (4.40)*. Let* $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{G}_\varepsilon(\Omega)$ *and suppose that* $\varepsilon \nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y g^0$*,* $\nabla g^1_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \nabla g^1$ *with* $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$*. Then*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(\eta^0_\varepsilon, \eta^1_\varepsilon) \; = \; \mathcal{L}^0(g^0, g^1). \tag{4.42}$$

Proof. Since $g^0_\varepsilon = 0$ on $\partial \Omega^0_\varepsilon$ (resp. $g^1_\varepsilon = 0$ on Γ), the convergence of $\varepsilon \nabla g^0_\varepsilon$ (resp. ∇g^1_ε) implies that $g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} g^0$ weakly two-scale and $g^1_\varepsilon \to g^1$ strongly in L^2. Thus, (4.42) follows by (4.40) and Proposition A.4.

□

4.2 Convergence in the small-strain regime ($\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$)

As is mentioned above, for $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$ the asymptotic behaviour is trivial: the infima of (3.7) and the associated low-energy sequence (φ_ε) converge to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$. In particular, this applies to the trivial displacement $\varphi_\varepsilon = 0$. For a more accurate description of the asymptotic behaviour we study the scaled elastic energy $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda_\varepsilon$. We prove that it Γ-converges to the limit energy

$$\Lambda^{\mathrm{small}}(g^0, g^1) := \int_\Omega \left(\int_Y Q_0(\nabla_y g^0) \, \mathrm{d}y + Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}(\nabla g^1) \right) \mathrm{d}x, \qquad (g^0, g^1) \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0)) \times H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$$

with respect to the weak two-scale splitting convergence introduced in Definition 3.8. Recall that Q_i is the quadratic form in the expansion of W_i at the identity (see Definition 2.1). We denote by $Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \to [0, \infty)$ the result of "perforated" homogenisation for Q_1 which is determined by the formula

$$Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}(F) := \min_{\psi \in H^1_\#(Y)} \int_{Y_1} Q_1(F + \nabla \psi(y)) \, \mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.43}$$

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that* $\lambda_\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$*. Then the sequence* $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda_\varepsilon$ *converges to* Λ^{small} *in the following sense:*

1. *(Lower bound). Let* $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *and* $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$*. The following implication holds:*

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1) \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) \geq \Lambda^{\mathrm{small}}(g^0, g^1).$$

2. *(Existence of recovery sequences). Let* $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$*. There exists a sequence* $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *and* $\psi \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}$ *such that*

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1, \psi) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2} \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \Lambda^{\mathrm{small}}(g^0, g^1).$$

Before proceeding to the proof, we use the convergence result above to gain a refined asymptotic analysis of the minimisation problem for (3.7). Namely, we show that the asymptotic low-energy behaviour of (3.7) is effectively described by the functional

$$\Lambda^{\mathrm{small}}(g^0, g^1) - \mathcal{L}^0(g^0, g^1), \qquad (g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega \times Y).$$

Let $(g^0_*, g^1_*) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega \times Y)$ be the unique minimiser of the above limit energy functional and let ψ_* satisfy

$$\int_\Omega Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}(\nabla g^1_*(x)) \, \mathrm{d}x = \iint_{\Omega \times Y_1} Q_1 \Big(\nabla g^1_*(x) + \nabla_y \psi_*(x, y) \Big) \, \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that* $\lambda > 0$*,* $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$*, and that* $(l_\varepsilon) \in L^2(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ *converges to* l^0 *and* l^1 *in the sense of* (4.40)*.*

1. *(Convergence of infima). The convergence*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \inf_{\varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)} \frac{1}{\lambda_\varepsilon^2} \left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi \, \mathrm{d}x \right) = \Lambda^{\mathrm{small}}(g^0_*, g^1_*) - \mathcal{L}^0(g^0_*, g^1_*). \tag{4.44}$$

   holds.

2. Let $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *be a sequence satisfying*

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon \, \mathrm{d}x \leq \inf_{\varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)} \left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi \, \mathrm{d}x \right) + o(\lambda_\varepsilon^2). \tag{4.45}$$

Then:

(a) (Weak two-scale convergence of minimising sequences). The convergence

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1} \varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0_*, g^1_*, \psi_*)$$

holds.

(b) (Strong convergence of minimising sequences). Let $(\tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon)$ *be a recovery sequence, i.e.* $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0_*, g^1_*, \psi_*)$*, and consider* $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon$*,* $(\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon$*, then*

$$||g^0_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + ||\varepsilon \nabla g^0_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \nabla \tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + ||g^1_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to 0$$

for all $1 \leq p < 2$*.*

We prove the proposition in Subsection 4.2.2.

4.2.1 Proof of Theorem 4.3

The following proof is a slight variation of an approach presented in [31] and combines convex homogenisation methods with a linearisation argument inspired by some of the methods in [23]. The core of this approach is the following statement (*cf.* [31, Theorem 5.2.1]).

Lemma 4.5. *Let* W *be a stored-energy function of class* $\mathcal{W}_\theta$ *and denote by* Q *the associated quadratic form in the expansion of* W *at the identity. Let* $(F_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)$*,* $F \in L^2(\Omega \times Y)$ *and let* c_ε *be a sequence of positive numbers converging to zero.*

1. If $F_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} F$*, then*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} c_\varepsilon^{-2} \int_\Omega W(I + c_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon) \, \mathrm{d}x \geq \iint_{\Omega \times Y} Q(F(x,y)) \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.46}$$

2. If $F_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} F$ *and* $\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} c_\varepsilon ||F_\varepsilon||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 0$*, then*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} c_\varepsilon^{-2} \int_\Omega W(I + c_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon) \, \mathrm{d}x = \iint_{\Omega \times Y} Q(F(x,y)) \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.47}$$

Proof. The proof relies on the weak lower semicontinuity (resp. strong continuity) of convex integral functionals and the property that W possesses quadratic behaviour near the identity. Therefore, let us recall the assumption (2.6):

$$W(I + G) = Q(G) + r(G), \qquad \text{where } r(G) = o(|G|^2) \quad \text{as } |G| \to 0. \tag{4.48}$$

Without loss of generality we assume that for all matrices G we have

$$|r(G)| \leq \rho(|G|) \, |G|^2 ,$$

where $\rho : [0, +\infty) \to [0, \infty]$ is an increasing function with $\lim_{g \to 0} \rho(g) = \rho(0) = 0$. To shorten the notation we define for $G \in L^2(\Omega)$ the functionals

$$I_\varepsilon(G) := c_\varepsilon^{-2} \int_\Omega W(I + c_\varepsilon G(x)) \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Taking advantage of the property of the unfolding operator $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$ referred to as "integral identity" in Proposition A.2, we find that

$$I_\varepsilon(G) = c_\varepsilon^{-2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times Y} W\Big(I + c_\varepsilon \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(G)(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.49}$$

Recall that the support of the periodic unfolding $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(G)$ associated to a map $G \in L^2(\Omega)$ is slightly larger than $\Omega{\times}Y$. We denote by $\widetilde{\Omega} \supset \Omega$ a bounded set such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(G) \subset \widetilde{\Omega}{\times}Y$ for small enough ε and all $G \in L^2(\Omega)$. Furthermore, we tacitly extend maps defined on $\Omega{\times}Y$ to $\mathbb{R}^d{\times}Y$ by zero.

Proof of (4.46). In order to apply the quadratic expansion (4.48) we "truncate the peaks" of F_ε and consider

$$\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y) & \text{if } \Big|\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big| \leq c_\varepsilon^{-1/2}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We claim that this modification does not affect the limit, *i.e.*

$$\widehat{F}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup F \qquad \text{weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d{\times}Y), \tag{4.50}$$

which can be seen as follows. By construction the sequence $(\widehat{F}_\varepsilon)$ is bounded in $L^2(\widetilde{\Omega}{\times}Y)$ and is therefore weakly relatively two-scale compact (see Proposition A.4). Thus, it suffices to show that $\widehat{F}_\varepsilon - \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon) \to 0$ in $L^1(\widetilde{\Omega}{\times}Y)$. Indeed, by the Hölder inequality we get

$$\Big\|\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon) - \widehat{F}_\varepsilon\Big\|_{L^1(\widetilde{\Omega}\times Y)} \leq \Big\|\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon) - \widehat{F}_\varepsilon\Big\|_{L^2(\widetilde{\Omega}\times Y)} a_\varepsilon^{1/2}, \tag{4.51}$$

where

$$a_\varepsilon := \Big|\big\{\, \widehat{F}_\varepsilon \neq \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon) \,\big\}\Big| = \Big|\big\{\, (x,y)\ :\ |\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)| > c_\varepsilon^{-1/2} \,\big\}\Big|.$$

Now, the Chebyshev inequality yields $a_\varepsilon \leq c_\varepsilon ||F_\varepsilon||^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Thus, the right-hand side of (4.51) goes to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and (4.50) follows.

Next, we argue that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} I_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon) \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times Y} Q(\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.52}$$

By assumption, W is minimised at the identity. Since $\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)$ equals either $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)$ or zero, we get $W\big(I + c_\varepsilon \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)\big) \geq W\big(I + c_\varepsilon \widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)\big)$. With (4.48) this yields the pointwise lower bound

$$c_\varepsilon^{-2} W\Big(I + c_\varepsilon \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big) \geq Q(\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)) - \rho\Big(c_\varepsilon|\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)|\Big)|\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)|^2.$$

We integrate both sides of the last inequality over $\mathbb{R}^d{\times}Y$. In view of (4.49), the left-hand side of the result equals $I_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)$. Since $\rho\big(c_\varepsilon|\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)|\big) \leq \rho(\sqrt{c_\varepsilon}) = o(1)$ and because the sequence $(\widehat{F}_\varepsilon)$ is bounded in L^2, we get

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times Y} \rho\Big(c_\varepsilon|\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)|\Big)|\widehat{F}_\varepsilon(x,y)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y = 0,$$

and (4.52) follows.

Now, (4.46) follows from (4.52), (4.50), and the lower semicontinuity of convex integral functionals with respect to weak convergence (see *e.g.* [21]).

Proof of (4.47). By appealing to the expansion (4.48) we obtain the pointwise estimate

$$c_\varepsilon^{-2} W\Big(I + c_\varepsilon \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big) \leq Q\Big(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big) \ +\ \rho\Big(c_\varepsilon||F_\varepsilon||_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\Big)\Big|\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big|^2.$$

Since $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)$ is bounded in L^2 (as a two-scale convergent sequence) and because of the assumption $\limsup_\varepsilon c_\varepsilon ||F_\varepsilon||_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 0$, the pointwise inequality implies that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} I_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon) \le \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times Y} Q\Big(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.53}$$

By assumption $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon)$ strongly converges in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times Y)$ to F (extended by zero to $\mathbb{R}^d\times Y$), hence the right-hand side of (4.53) equals $\iint_{\Omega\times Y} Q(F)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y$ and we get

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} I_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon) \le \iint_{\Omega\times Y} Q(F(x,y))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.54}$$

Now (4.47) follows from (4.54) and the lim inf-inequality (4.46). □

Proof of Theorem 4.3, (Lower bound). We only need to consider the case when $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon)$ converges to a finite number as $\varepsilon\to 0$. By appealing to Proposition 3.10 we pass to a subsequence (not relabelled) such that $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0,g^1,\psi)$ with $(g^0,g^1,\psi)\in\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$. Set

$$F_\varepsilon^0 := \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\chi_\varepsilon^0\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon, \qquad F_\varepsilon^1 := \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\chi_\varepsilon^1\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon. \tag{4.55}$$

By definition of the ε-splitting, we have

$$F_\varepsilon^0 = \varepsilon\nabla g_\varepsilon^0 + \varepsilon^\gamma\chi_\varepsilon^0\nabla g_\varepsilon^1, \qquad F_\varepsilon^1 = \chi_\varepsilon^1\nabla g_\varepsilon^1,$$

where $(g_\varepsilon^0,g_\varepsilon^1) \rightsquigarrow \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon$. Since the differences $\chi_\varepsilon^i(x)-\chi^i(x/\varepsilon)$, $i=0,1$, converge to zero in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$, we get via Proposition A.4:

$$F_\varepsilon^0 \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y g^0(x,y), \qquad F_\varepsilon^1 \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \chi^1(y)\Big(\nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y)\Big).$$

It is easy to see that

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\int_\Omega W_0(I+\lambda_\varepsilon F_\varepsilon^0(x))\,\mathrm{d}x + \lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\varepsilon^{-2\gamma}\int_\Omega W_1(I+\lambda_\varepsilon\varepsilon^\gamma F_\varepsilon^1(x))\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.56}$$

Indeed, by assumption W_i vanishes at the identity, therefore $W_i(I+G)\chi = W_i(I+\chi G)$, $i=0,1$, for all matrices G and $\chi\in\{0,1\}$. Now (4.56) follows from the definition of $(F_\varepsilon^0,F_\varepsilon^1)$ as a decomposition of φ_ε.

Finally, we apply the lim inf inequality from Lemma 4.5 to each of the two integrals in the right-hand side of (4.56) and get

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) \ge \iint_{\Omega\times Y} Q_0(\nabla_y g^0(x,y))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y + \iint_{\Omega\times Y_1} Q_1\Big(\nabla g^1(x)+\nabla_y\psi(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

Since the second integral is bounded below by $\int_\Omega Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}(\nabla g^1(x))\,\mathrm{d}x$, the lower-bound statement of Theorem 4.3 follows.

Proof of Theorem 4.3, (Existence of recovery sequences). Let ψ be a minimiser in $L^2(\Omega;H^1_\#(Y))$ of the functional

$$\iint_{\Omega\times Y_1} Q_1\Big(\nabla g^1(x)+\nabla_y\psi(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y. \tag{4.57}$$

Since the domain of integration in (4.57) is $\Omega\times Y_1$, we can define ψ in $\Omega\times Y_0$ at will. In particular, we assume that $\psi\in\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$. Let $(\widetilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon)\subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ denote the sequence associated to (g^0,g^1,ψ) via Proposition 3.13 with $c_\varepsilon=\lambda_\varepsilon$ and set $\varphi_\varepsilon=\lambda_\varepsilon\widetilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon$. As in the proof of the lower bound, we consider the decomposition $(F^0_\varepsilon, F^1_\varepsilon)$ of the displacement gradient $\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon$ according to the formulae (4.55), so the identity (4.56) holds. By Proposition 3.13 (*cf.* (3.23), (3.24)) we have

$$F^0_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2} \nabla_y g^0(x,y), \qquad F^1_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2} \Big(\nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y \psi(x,y)\Big)\chi_1(x,y),$$
$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\Big(\lambda_\varepsilon \|F^0_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \lambda_\varepsilon \varepsilon^\gamma \|F^1_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\Big) = 0.$$

Now the second statement of Lemma 4.5, applied first with $c_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon$, $F_\varepsilon = F^0_\varepsilon$ and then with $c_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon\varepsilon^\gamma$, $F_\varepsilon = F^1_\varepsilon$, yields

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \iint_{\Omega\times Y} Q_0(\nabla_y g^0(x,y))\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y + \iint_{\Omega\times Y_1} Q_1\Big(\nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

This concludes the proof, in view of the fact that the second integral in the last formula equals $\int_\Omega Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}(\nabla g)\,\mathrm{d}x$. ☐

4.2.2 Proof of Proposition 4.4

The proof is divided into seven steps. In Step 1 we deduce convergence of minima and weak two-scale convergence of minimisers by appealing to standard arguments from Γ-convergence. The goal of the remaining steps is to improve the convergence to strong two-scale convergence. In a nutshell, the idea is to "gain strong convergence by strict convexity". In order to apply this paradigm we have to replace the non-convex energy by its linearised version, the main part of the related argument is contained in Steps 3–5. In Step 3 we show that for minimising sequences the linearised energy converges as well, at least after "truncating peaks". To handle the truncation error, in Step 4 we modify the minimising sequence on small sets to gain equi-integrability. Finally, in Steps 6 and 7 we compare the minimising sequence with the recovery sequence by estimating the differences between the original, the modified and the recovery sequence.

For convenience we introduce the abbreviations

$$e_0 := \Lambda^{\mathrm{small}}(g^0_*, g^1_*), \qquad l_0 := \mathcal{L}^0(g^0_*, g^1_*), \qquad m_0 := e_0 - l_0.$$

Furthermore, let $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ denote the ε-splitting associated to $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon$.

Step 1 (Convergence of the energy and weak convergence of minimisers). As well as for classical Γ-convergence, the "lower bound" and "recovery sequence" properties in Theorem 4.3 together with the compactness result in Proposition 3.10 imply the convergence of the infima in (4.44) and of any minimising sequence to the minimum and the minimiser, respectively, of the limiting functional. Indeed, since $\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon\cdot\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$ for $\varphi = 0$, one has $\inf_{\varphi\in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)}\big(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon\cdot\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x\big) \le 0$. Then the condition (4.45) implies via Corollary 3.5 that $\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) < \infty$. By Proposition 3.10 there exists a triple $(g^0, g^1, \psi) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$ such that, up to a subsequence, one has $\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\mathrm{sp}2} (g^0, g^1, \psi)$.

By the assumption (4.45), Theorem 4.3 (Lower bound) and Lemma 4.2, we have $\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lambda_\varepsilon^{-2}\inf_{\varphi\in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)}\big(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon\cdot\varphi\,\mathrm{d}x\big) \ge m_0$. In turn, the "recovery sequence" property of Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 4.2 yield the opposite inequality, and (4.44) follows. By the uniqueness of the minimiser we get $(g^0, g^1, \psi) = (g^0_*, g^1_*, \psi_*)$, and hence

$$\lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\varphi_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\mathrm{sp}2} (g^0_*, g^1_*, \psi_*).$$

Step 2 ((Lower semi-)continuity of quantities associated to the linearised energy). In this step we gather some continuity properties for the linearised energy, the associated bilinear functional and the load term. For matrix-valued functions $G^0, F^0, G^1, F^1 \in L^2(\Omega)$ define

$$\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(G^0, G^1) := \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} Q_0(G^0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon} Q_1(G^1)\,\mathrm{d}x,$$
$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(G^0, G^1; F^0, F^1) := \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} B_0(G^0; F^0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon} B_1(G^1, F^1)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

where B_i, $i = 0, 1$, denotes the bilinear form associated to the quadratic form Q_i, *i.e.*

$$\forall A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}\ :\ B_i(A; B) := \frac{1}{2}\left(Q_i(A + B) - Q_i(A) - Q_i(B) \right).$$

The following (lower semi-)continuity properties hold: If

$$G^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} G^0, \quad G^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} G^1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad F^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} F^0, \quad F^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} F^1,$$

in L^2, then

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(G^0_\varepsilon, G^1_\varepsilon) \geq \int_\Omega \left(\int_{Y_0} Q_0(G^0(x, y))\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{Y_1} Q_1(G^1(x, y))\,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x, \tag{4.58}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(F^0_\varepsilon, F^1_\varepsilon) = \int_\Omega \left(\int_{Y_0} Q_0(F^0(x, y))\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{Y_1} Q_1(F^1(x, y))\,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x, \tag{4.59}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(G^0_\varepsilon, G^1_\varepsilon; F^0_\varepsilon, F^1_\varepsilon) = \int_\Omega \Bigg(&\int_{Y_0} B_0(G^0(x, y), F^0(x, y))\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &+ \int_{Y_1} B_1(G^1(x, y), F^1(x, y))\,\mathrm{d}y \Bigg) \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{4.60}$$

The statements (4.58) and (4.59) are well known and follow by "lower semicontinuity with respect to weak two-scale convergence" of convex integral functionals and "continuity with respect to strong two-scale convergence" of continuous integral functionals (see *e.g.* [37]). The statement (4.60) is due to the fact that it contains only products of strongly and weakly two-scale convergent quantities.

Step 3 (Convergence of the truncated linearised energy). We claim that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \left(\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_0(\varepsilon \nabla g^0_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_1(\nabla g^1_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \right) = m_0 \tag{4.61}$$

for a sequence (X_ε) of measurable subsets of Ω with $|X_\varepsilon| \to 0$.

For purposes of our argument let X_ε consist of those $x \in \Omega$ where $\min\{|\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon(x)|, |\nabla g^1_\varepsilon(x)|\} > \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1/2}$. Recall that the sequences $(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)$ and (∇g^1_ε) are bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$. Hence, in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.5, one has

$$|X_\varepsilon| \to 0, \qquad \varepsilon\chi_\varepsilon \nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y g^0_*, \qquad \chi_\varepsilon \nabla g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla g^1_* + \nabla_y \psi_*, \tag{4.62}$$

where χ_ε denotes the indicator function of $\Omega \setminus X_\varepsilon$. Due to the quadratic expansion for W_i, $i = 0, 1$ (see (2.6)) and the fact that $\varepsilon^\gamma \nabla g^1_\varepsilon \to 0$ strongly in L^2, we find, in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.5, that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_\varepsilon^2}\left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega l_\varepsilon \cdot \varphi_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x \right) \geq \left(\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_0(\varepsilon\nabla g^\varepsilon_0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_1(\nabla g^\varepsilon_1)\,\mathrm{d}x \right) - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) + r_\varepsilon \tag{4.63}$$

where $r_\varepsilon \to 0$. Since the left-hand side of (4.63) converges to m_0, we get

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 \ &\geq\ \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \left\{ \left(\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_0(\varepsilon\nabla g^\varepsilon_0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_1(\nabla g^\varepsilon_1)\,\mathrm{d}x \right) - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \right\} \\ &\geq\ \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \left\{ \left(\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_0(\varepsilon\nabla g^\varepsilon_0)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon \setminus X_\varepsilon} Q_1(\nabla g^\varepsilon_1)\,\mathrm{d}x \right) - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \right\} \\ &\geq\ \int_\Omega \left(\int_{Y_0} Q_0(\nabla_y g^0_*)\,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{Y_1} Q_1(\nabla g^1_* + \nabla_y \psi_*)\,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x - \mathcal{L}^0(g^0, g^1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.58), (4.62) and (4.42) in order to pass to the limit. Since the last expression in the previous estimate equals m_0, the assertion follows.

Step 4 (Equi-integrable decomposition). In order to motivate the following steps, let us remark that if the linearised energy $\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon, \nabla g^1_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ converged to the minima m_0, then we could obtain strong two-scale convergence of $\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon$ and ∇g^1_ε by appealing to the paradigm of "strong convergence by strict convexity". However, (4.42) ignores the energy contribution emerging in the subset X_ε. Clearly, if we knew that

$$||\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon\cap X_\varepsilon)} + ||\nabla g^\varepsilon_1||_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon\cap X_\varepsilon)} \to 0, \tag{4.64}$$

then (4.42) would also hold for $X_\varepsilon = \emptyset$. Unfortunately, (4.64) is not valid for general sequences. To overcome this difficulty we modify $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ on small sets in such a way that the resulting sequence is equi-integrable and (4.64) is satisfied. To make this precise, we claim that for a subsequence (not relabeled) there exist sequences $(\bar g^0_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_0(\Omega)$, $(\bar g^1_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ such that $\bar g^1_\varepsilon$ satisfy (3.8), the convergence statements

$$\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon - \varepsilon\nabla \bar g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} 0, \qquad\qquad \nabla g^1_\varepsilon - \nabla \bar g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} 0, \tag{4.65}$$

$$||\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon - \varepsilon\nabla \bar g^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega)} \to 0, \qquad\qquad ||\nabla g^1_\varepsilon - \nabla \bar g^1_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega)} \to 0 \tag{4.66}$$

hold, and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\big(\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla \bar g^0_\varepsilon, \nabla \bar g^1_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(\bar g^0_\varepsilon, \bar g^1_\varepsilon)\big) = m_0. \tag{4.67}$$

The argument relies on the well-known Decomposition Lemma by Fonseca, Müller and Pedregal (see [22]). By appealing to Lemma 4.6 and passing to a subsequence (not relabelled), we find that there exist sequences $(\bar g^0_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_0(\Omega)$, $(\bar g^1_\varepsilon) \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ and "exceptional" sets

$$\bar X_\varepsilon := \{\, x \in \Omega \,:\, g^0_\varepsilon(x) \neq \bar g^0_\varepsilon(x) \text{ or } g^1_\varepsilon(x) \neq \bar g^1_\varepsilon(x) \,\}$$

such that the sequences $(|\varepsilon\nabla \bar g^0_\varepsilon|^2)$ and $(|\nabla \bar g^1_\varepsilon|^2)$ are equi-integrable and $|\bar X_\varepsilon| \to 0$. Clearly, by construction, (4.65) and (4.66) hold whenever $1 \le p < 2$. It remains to prove the key identity (4.67). By virtue of (4.65), the lower semicontinuity property (4.58) and Lemma 4.2, it suffices to argue that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\big(\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla \bar g^0_\varepsilon, \nabla \bar g^1_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{L}^\varepsilon(\bar g^0_\varepsilon, \bar g^1_\varepsilon)\big) \le m_0.$$

Let χ_ε and $\bar\chi_\varepsilon$ denote the characteristic function of X_ε (the set from step 3) and $\bar X_\varepsilon$, respectively. To simplify the notation we use the shorthand $G_\varepsilon := (\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon, \nabla g^1_\varepsilon)$ and $\bar G_\varepsilon := (\varepsilon\nabla \bar g^0_\varepsilon, \nabla \bar g^1_\varepsilon)$. Taking into account (4.61), it suffices to show that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\big(\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\bar G_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon((1-\chi_\varepsilon)G_\varepsilon)\big) \le 0.$$

By the quadratic property of Q_ε and by the (pointwise) orthogonality of $\bar\chi_\varepsilon$ and $1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\bar G_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon((1-\chi_\varepsilon)G_\varepsilon) &= \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\bar\chi_\varepsilon \bar G_\varepsilon) + \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon((1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)\bar G_\varepsilon) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\bar\chi_\varepsilon(1-\chi_\varepsilon)G_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon((1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)(1-\chi_\varepsilon)G_\varepsilon).\end{aligned} \tag{4.68}$$

By definition of the set $\bar X_\varepsilon$ we have $(1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)\bar G_\varepsilon = (1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)G_\varepsilon$, thus we can simplify the sum of the second and fourth term in the right-hand side of the equation (4.68) as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon((1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)\bar G_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon((1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)(1-\chi_\varepsilon)G_\varepsilon) = \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\chi_\varepsilon(1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)\bar G_\varepsilon).$$

Using the fact that the third term in the right-hand side of (4.68) is negative, we arrive at the inequality

$$\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\bar G_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon((1-\chi_\varepsilon)G_\varepsilon) \le \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\bar\chi_\varepsilon \bar G_\varepsilon) + \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\chi_\varepsilon(1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon)\bar G_\varepsilon).$$

By construction the sequences $(\chi_\varepsilon(1-\bar\chi_\varepsilon))$ and $(\bar\chi_\varepsilon)$ converge to zero boundedly in measure as $\varepsilon \to 0$, thus, by equi-integrability the right-hand side of (4.68) vanishes in the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and the argument is complete.

Step 5 (Comparison with the recovery sequence). Recall that $\tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon$ denotes a recovery sequence associated to (g^0_*, g^1_*, ψ_*) and $(\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \lambda_\varepsilon^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon$. Let $(\bar{g}^0_\varepsilon, \bar{g}^1_\varepsilon)$ denote the modification of $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ according to (4.65)–(4.67). In order to monitor the difference between the modified sequence $(\bar{g}^0_\varepsilon, \bar{g}^1_\varepsilon)$ and the recovery sequence $(\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon)$, we define

$$\bar{\eta}^0_\varepsilon := \bar{g}^0_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \qquad \bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon := \bar{g}^1_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon.$$

We claim that, up to a subsequence,

$$\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} |\operatorname{sym} \nabla(\varepsilon\bar{\eta}^0_\varepsilon)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon} |\operatorname{sym} \nabla\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{4.69}$$

In order to show (4.69), we set

$$e_0 := \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon).$$

Note that the above limit exists since $(\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon)$ is a recovery sequence. Furthermore, by (4.67) and Lemma 4.2 we deduce that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\bar{g}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\bar{g}^1_\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon) = e_0.$$

Clearly

$$\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\bar{\eta}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon) = \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\bar{g}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\bar{g}^1_\varepsilon) - 2\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\bar{g}^0, \nabla\bar{g}^1_\varepsilon; \varepsilon\nabla\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon) + \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon),$$

where we can pass to the limit in the bilinear term by (4.60):

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\bar{g}^0, \nabla\bar{g}^1_\varepsilon; \varepsilon\nabla\tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_\Omega \left(\int_{Y_0} Q_0(\nabla_y g^0_*(x,y)) \,\mathrm{d}y + \int_{Y_1} Q_1(\nabla g^1_*(x) + \nabla\psi_*(x,y)) \,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x = e_0.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla\bar{\eta}^0_\varepsilon, \nabla\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon) \to 0$ and since the quadratic forms Q_0 and Q_1 are positive definite on the space of symmetric matrices, (4.69) follows.

Step 6 (Convergence of the stiff part). In this step we prove that

$$||g^1_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{4.70}$$

We set $\eta^1_\varepsilon := g^1_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^1_\varepsilon$, and assume without loss of generality that $3/2 < p < 2$. By construction we then have $\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} \nabla\eta^1_\varepsilon : \nabla\zeta \,\mathrm{d}x = 0$ for all $\zeta \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ which allows one to apply Lemma 3.14, once it is shown that

$$||\eta^1_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \to 0.$$

Note that $\eta^1_\varepsilon = g^1_\varepsilon - \bar{g}^1_\varepsilon + \bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon$ and consequently

$$||\eta^1_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \le ||g^1_\varepsilon - \bar{g}^1_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} + ||\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon||_{W^{1,p}(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}.$$

The first term in the right-hand side of the last inequality vanishes up to a subsequence due to (4.66) and the property that $g^1_\varepsilon = \bar{g}^1_\varepsilon$ on Γ. Regarding the second term, it suffices to show that $||\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon||_{H^1(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. To this end, let $\hat{\eta}^1_\varepsilon$ denote the extension of $\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon|_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon}$ to Ω according to Lemma 3.2. Using the boundary condition $\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon = \hat{\eta}^1_\varepsilon = 0$ on Γ, the Korn inequality and (3.12) we get

$$||\hat{\eta}^1_\varepsilon||_{H^1(\Omega)} \le c'||\operatorname{sym}\nabla\hat{\eta}^1_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} \le c''||\operatorname{sym}\nabla\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}. \tag{4.71}$$

Now, the left-hand side of (4.71) controls $||\bar{\eta}^1_\varepsilon||_{H^1(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}$, while its right-hand side vanishes by (4.69) up to a subsequence. Since the above argument applies to each subsequence, (4.70) holds for the entire sequence.

Step 7 (Convergence of the soft part). In this step we prove that

$$||g^0_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + ||\varepsilon\nabla(g^0_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon)||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{4.72}$$

The argument is similar to that of Step 6. We set $\eta^0_\varepsilon := g^0_\varepsilon - \tilde{g}^0_\varepsilon$, where $\bar{g}^0_\varepsilon$ is defined according to (4.65) and (4.66). Since $\eta^0_\varepsilon = 0$ on $\partial\Omega^0_\varepsilon$ we have, by applying the Poincaré on Y_0 and rescaling:

$$||\eta^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \leq c||\varepsilon \,\mathrm{sym}\, \nabla \eta^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}.$$

The identity $\eta^0_\varepsilon = g^0_\varepsilon - \bar{g}^0_\varepsilon + \bar{\eta}^0_\varepsilon$ yields

$$||\eta^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \leq c'||\varepsilon \,\mathrm{sym}\, \nabla \eta^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} \leq c'' \left(||\varepsilon \,\mathrm{sym}\, \nabla g^0_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \,\mathrm{sym}\, \nabla \bar{g}^0_\varepsilon||_{L^p(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} + ||\varepsilon \,\mathrm{sym}\, \nabla \bar{\eta}^0_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)}\right).$$

The right-hand side of the last inequality vanishes up to a subsequence due to (4.66) and (4.69). Since this argument applies to each subsequence, (4.72) holds for the entire sequence.

□

Lemma 4.6 (Decomposition Lemma, see [22], [27]). *Let $v \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}$ and let (v_ε) be a sequence with $v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v$ in $H^1(\Omega)$. Then there exists a sequence $(\bar{v}_\varepsilon) \subset H^1(\Omega)$ such that the following properties hold for a subsequence of v_ε (not relabelled):*

1. *$\bar{v}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v$ in $H^1(\Omega)$;*
2. *$\bar{v}_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon$ in a neighbourhood of $\partial\Omega$;*
3. *$(|\nabla \bar{v}_\varepsilon|^2)$ is equi-integrable;*
4. *$|\{\, x \in \Omega \,:\, v_\varepsilon(x) \neq \bar{v}_\varepsilon(x) \,\}| \to 0$.*

4.3 The finite-strain regime ($\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$)

In this section we consider the case $\lambda_\varepsilon \sim 1$, when, unlike in the small-load regime, the strain emerging in the soft component is not necessarily small but only bounded as $\varepsilon \to 0$. As a consequence, passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ does not result in a linearisation of the functional on the soft component so that we have to deal with the full non-convex problem. It is well-known from the work by S. Müller [30] and A. Braides [7], where the homogenisation of non-convex integral functionals is discussed, that minimisers of periodic non-convex integral functionals tend to oscillate on scales larger than the period of the material. As a consequence of this, the homogenised energy density is given by a mutli-cell homogenisation formula that involves minimisation over an infinitely large ensemble of periodicity cells, in contrast to the one-cell homogenisation formula of the convex case. For the same reason a lower semicontinuity result for non-convex integral functionals with respect to weak two-scale splitting convergence does not hold in general.

To overcome this difficulty we prove Γ-convergence of Λ_ε with respect to the stronger two-scale splitting convergence as defined in Definition 3.8, which forces the gradients $\nabla_y g^0_\varepsilon$ to oscillate essentially on the scale ε. However, we find, as an associated drawback, that in general the sequence (Λ_ε) is no longer equi-coercive, and thus we do not gain convergence of the related sequence of infima and almost minimisers by the standard machinery of Γ-convergence. While in general in the non-convex situation the strong two-scale convergence of minimisers cannot be expected, in our context we are able to prove convergence of the sequence of infima to the minimum of the Γ-limit by following the arguments developed in [14]. We also refer the reader to [14] for a detailed discussion of the related issues.

4.3.1 Modified setting and main result

Next we describe the problem setup in the finite-load regime. Since in this case no linearisation takes place on the soft component, we drop the assumption that W_0 admits a quadratic expansion at the identity. However, we now assume that W_0 satisfies a quadratic growth condition at infinity and is quasiconvex. Note that the combination of both conditions implies that W_0 is locally Lipschitz continuous. More precisely, we assume that for some positive constants $\theta, \Theta > 0$:

- W_0 is a quasiconvex map from $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ to $[0, \infty)$ such that $W_0(I) = 0$;

- $\theta \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(d)) \le W_0(F) \le \Theta(1+|F|^2)$ for any $F \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$;
- $\big|W_0(F+G) - W_0(F)\big| \le \Theta\big(1+|F|+|G|\big)|G|$ for any $F, G \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$.

Under the above conditions we prove that the sequence (Λ_ε) Γ-converges to the limit energy

$$\Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(g^0, g^1) := \int_\Omega \left(\int_Y W_0(I + \nabla_y g^0)\,\mathrm{d}y + Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}(\nabla g^1) \right) \mathrm{d}x,\ \ (g^0, g^1) \in L^2(\Omega; H_0^1(Y_0)) \times H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega),$$

with respect to the strong two-scale convergence as introduced in Definition 3.8. Recall that Q_1^{hom} is the homogenisation of the quadratic form from the expansion of W_1 as defined in (4.43). Furthermore, we analyse the total energy including the force term.

Without loss of generality we assume that $\lambda_\varepsilon = 1$

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that W_0 satisfies the assumptions listed above and W_1 is of class $\mathcal{W}_\theta$. Then Λ_ε converge to the functional Λ^{large} in the following sense:*

1. *(Lower bound). Let $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ and $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega{\times}Y)$. Then*

$$\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1) \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) \ge \Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(g^0, g^1).$$

2. *(Existence of recovery sequences). Let $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega{\times}Y)$. There exists a sequence $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) = \Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(g^0, g^1).$$

Suppose that $(l_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)^d$ converges in the sense of (4.40).

3. *(Convergence of the load term). Let $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ with $\limsup_\varepsilon \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) < \infty$. Then*

$$\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1) \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_\Omega \varphi_\varepsilon \cdot l_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x = \mathcal{L}^0(g^0, g^1).$$

4. *(Convergence of infima). The convergence*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \inf_{H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)} \left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega \varphi_\varepsilon \cdot \ l_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x \right) = \min_{(g^0,g^1)\in\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)} \left(\Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(g^0, g^1) - \mathcal{L}^0(g^0, g^1) \right).$$

   holds.

Remark 4.8. *By quasiconvexity of W_0 and the argument of [14, Section 9], the limit functional*

$$\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega{\times}Y) \ni (g^0, g^1) \mapsto \Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(g^0, g^1) - L(g^0, g^1)$$

admits a minimiser, which is a property that is used in the argument for (Convergence of infima). It should be mentioned that the non-degeneracy condition is stable under quasiconvexification. Indeed, Zhang proved in [38] that the quasiconvexification of the function $\Psi(F) = \operatorname{dist}^2(F, \mathrm{SO}(d))$ is bounded below by $c'\Psi$ itself, where c' is a constant that only depends on the dimension d. For this reason the quasiconvexity assumption on W_0 is not too restrictive.

Remark 4.9. *Our result can be generalised to non-quasiconvex W_0 in a straightforward way by appealing to a lower semicontinuity result developed in [14]. However, the restriction to quasiconvex W_0 in Theorem 4.7 makes the present paper self-contained. In a nutshell, in [14] the authors show (for continuous W satisfying standard growth conditions) the* lim inf *inequality*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon^0} W(\varepsilon\nabla v_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x \ge \iint_{\Omega\times Y_0} \mathcal{Q}W(\nabla_y v)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x$$

along sequences $(v_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ *with* $v_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2} v$ *and* $\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon \xrightharpoonup{2} \nabla_y v$ *where* $v \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0))$*. Here* $\mathcal{Q}W$ *stands for the quasiconvex envelope of* W*. Further, they construct recovery sequences (converging in the same topology) such that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} W(\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon) \, \mathrm{d}x = \iint_{\Omega \times Y_0} \mathcal{Q}W(\nabla_y v) \, \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

The key difference between the two approaches lies in the notion of convergence. In contrast to the convergence type used in Theorem 4.7 which corresponds to strong two-scale convergence of $\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon$*, the results in [14] only require weak two-scale convergence of* $\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon$*. In this way, the quantity* $\varepsilon \nabla v_\varepsilon$ *might oscillate on scales larger than* ε*, which makes the analysis more subtle but still allows one to carry out the quasiconvexification.*

4.3.2 Auxiliary statements

For the proof of the theorem and the subsequent discussion it is convenient to decompose Λ_ε and Λ^{large} into the energy contributions associated to the soft and stiff component. Namely, for $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon) \times H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ and $(g^0, g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega \times Y)$ we define

$$\Lambda^0_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon) := \int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} W_0(I + \varepsilon \nabla g^0_\varepsilon(x)) \, \mathrm{d}x, \qquad \Lambda^1_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) := \varepsilon^{-2\gamma} \int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon} W_0(I + \varepsilon^\gamma \nabla g^1_\varepsilon(x)) \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

$$\Lambda^0_0(g^0) := \iint_{\Omega \times Y_0} W_0(I + \nabla_y g^0(x,y)) \, \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}x, \qquad \Lambda^1_0(g^1) := \int_\Omega Q^{\text{hom}}_1(\nabla g^1(x)) \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Clearly, we then have $\Lambda^{\text{large}}(g^0, g^1) = \Lambda^0_0(g^0) + \Lambda^1_0(g^1)$. The following estimate is a direct consequence of the local Lipschitz continuity of W_0 and the *a priori* estimate of Theorem 3.4.

Lemma 4.10. *There exists a constant* $c > 0$ *such that for any* $\varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *and any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *the inequality*

$$\Big| \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \big(\Lambda^0_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) + \Lambda^1_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) \big) \Big| \le c(1 + \Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi)) \varepsilon^\gamma$$

holds, where $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi$*.*

Let us briefly sketch the argument for the convergence proof for the infima in Theorem 4.7. To this end let φ be a displacement and $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon)$ the associated ε-splitting. By construction we have $g^0_\varepsilon \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ and by definition of the unfolding operator, the function $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon)$ can be identified with a map in $L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0))$. The proof of (Convergence of infima) relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 4.11. *Let* $\varphi \in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ *and* $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi$*, then*

$$\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon) \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0)), \qquad \nabla_y \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla g^0_\varepsilon), \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \Lambda^0_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon) = \Lambda^0_0\Big(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon)\Big).$$

Together with the decomposition indicated in Lemma 4.10, the above identities allow one to minimise the energy associated to the soft component at an intermediate stage (*i.e.* for $\varepsilon > 0$). In this way we get for positive $\varepsilon > 0$ a sufficiently good lower bound for $\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon)$, which is essentially of the form

$$\min_{g^0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0))} \Lambda^0_0(g^0) - \iint_{\Omega \times Y_0} g^0 \cdot l^0 \, \mathrm{d}y \, \mathrm{d}x + \Lambda^1_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega g^1_\varepsilon \cdot l^\varepsilon_1 \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Importantly, only the energy contribution associated to the stiff component depends on ε. Since the behaviour of Λ_ε on the stiff component is nice, in the sense that the corresponding energy contribution Λ^1_ε is lower semicontinuous with respect to weak two-scale convergence, we can pass to the lim inf and obtain the convergence of the infima.

4.3.3 Proof of Theorem 4.7

The proof is divided into five steps. We consider the behaviour of the elastic energy on the soft and stiff component separately. The argument for the stiff part, where the linearisation takes place, is similar to the one used in the proof of Theorem 4.3. For the soft part we make use of the strong two-scale continuity property of continuous integral functionals satisfying standard growth conditions (see for instance [37]). The crucial element in our proof is Step 5 below, where we prove the convergence of infima, by appealing to the equi-coercivity of Λ_ε with respect to the weak two-scale splitting convergence introduced in Definition 3.8.

Step 1 (Strong two-scale continuity of Λ^0_ε). Let $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1)$ and $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi_\varepsilon$, then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Lambda^0_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon) = \iint_{\Omega\times Y} W_0(I + \nabla_y g^0(x,y))\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.73}$$

In order to see this, notice first that one has

$$\int_{\Omega^0_\varepsilon} W_0(I + \varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon(x))\,\mathrm{d}x = \iint_{\Omega\times Y_0} W_0\Big(I + \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

where $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$ denotes the unfolding operator (see Definition A.1). Using the strong two-scale convergence of $\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon$ and the continuity of W_0 we have, for a subsequence,

$$W_0\Big(I + \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla\varphi_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big) \to W_0(I + \nabla_y g^0(x,y)) \qquad \text{a.e. in } \Omega\times Y_0.$$

Furthermore, the quadratic growth of W_0 at infinity yields the bound

$$\Big|W_0\Big(I + \varepsilon\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big)\Big| \le c\Big|I + \varepsilon\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\nabla g^0_\varepsilon)(x,y)\Big|^2$$

for $c > 0$, where the expression in the right-hand side converges strongly in $L^1(\Omega\times Y_0)$. Our claim follows (first for a subsequence) by dominated convergence. Since the above reasoning applies to any subsequence of a subsequence, (4.73) holds for the entire sequence.

Step 2 (Proof of the lower bound). Clearly, we only need to consider the case when $\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon)$ converges to a finite number. Let $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi_\varepsilon$. Since $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1)$ by assumption, we find using Proposition 3.10 that

$$\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \nabla_y g^0(x,y), \qquad \nabla g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y)$$

for some $\psi \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y))$ and up to a subsequence.

By virtue of Lemma 4.10 and Step 1, it suffices to prove that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \varepsilon^{-2\gamma}\int_\Omega W_1(I + \varepsilon^\gamma\nabla g^1_\varepsilon(x))\,\mathrm{d}x \ge \iint_\Omega Q_1^{\mathrm{hom}}(\nabla g^1(x))\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

But this follows in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Step 3 (Proof of the existence of recovery sequences). Let $\psi \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$ be a minimiser of the functional

$$\iint_{\Omega\times Y_1} Q_1\Big(\nabla g^1(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

and $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ denote the sequence associated to (g^0, g^1) and ψ via Proposition 3.13. Then $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\to} (g^0, g^1)$ and in particular we have

$$\varepsilon\nabla g^0_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \nabla_y g(x,y), \qquad \nabla g^1_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} \nabla g(x) + \nabla_y\psi(x,y),$$

where $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi_\varepsilon$. By Lemma 4.10 it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Lambda^0_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon) = \iint_{\Omega\times Y_0} W_0(I + \nabla_y g^0(x,y))\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{4.74}$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Lambda^1_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) = \iint_{\Omega} Q_1^{\hom}(\nabla g^1(x))\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.75}$$

Convergence (4.74) is proved in Step 1 and (4.75) follows as in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Step 4 (Convergence of the load term). The statement follows directly from the condition (4.40), Definition 3.8 and Proposition A.4.

Step 5 (Convergence of infima). For brevity we set

$$e_\varepsilon := \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \inf_{\varphi\in H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)} \left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi) - \int_\Omega \varphi\cdot\ l_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x\right).$$

$$e_0 := \min_{(g^0,g^1)\in\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)} \left(\Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(g^0,g^1) - \mathcal{L}^0(g^0,g^1)\right).$$

We have to prove that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} e_\varepsilon = e_0$. Note that the inequality $\limsup_\varepsilon e_\varepsilon \le e_0$ follows directly from the the existence of recovery sequences, and the property that the limiting energy admits a minimiser. Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} e_\varepsilon \ge e_0. \tag{4.76}$$

Let $(\varphi_\varepsilon) \subset H^1_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega)$ be a sequence of (almost) minimisers, *i.e.*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \left| e_\varepsilon - \left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega \varphi_\varepsilon\cdot\ l_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x\right)\right| = 0, \tag{4.77}$$

and $(g^0_\varepsilon, g^1_\varepsilon) \leftrightsquigarrow \varphi_\varepsilon$ the associated splitting. By Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 3.10 we can pass to a subsequence (not relabeled) such that $\varphi_\varepsilon \overset{\mathrm{sp2}}{\rightharpoonup} (g^0, g^1)$ for some $(g^0,g^1) \in \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma,0}(\Omega\times Y)$. Using the decomposition estimate of Lemma 4.10, the identity from Lemma 4.11, and by appealing to the definition of l^0_ε and l^1_ε, we rewrite the total energy as

$$\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega \varphi_\varepsilon\cdot l_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x = \Lambda^0_0\Big(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon)\Big) + \Lambda^1_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) - \iint_{\Omega\times Y_0} g^0_\varepsilon\cdot l^0_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega g^1_\varepsilon\cdot l^1_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x + O(\varepsilon^\gamma).$$

Setting $G_\varepsilon := \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(g^0_\varepsilon)$ we can express the right-hand side of the last identity by means of the limiting energy:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega \varphi_\varepsilon\cdot l_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x \quad &= \quad \Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(G_\varepsilon, g^1) - \mathcal{L}^0(G_\varepsilon, g^1)\\
&\quad + \quad \big(\Lambda^1_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) - \Lambda^1_0(g^1)\big)\\
&\quad + \quad \iint_{\Omega\times Y_0} G_\varepsilon\cdot(l^0 - l^0_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y \qquad (4.78)\\
&\quad + \quad \iint_\Omega (g^1\cdot l^1 - g^1_\varepsilon\cdot l^1_\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x + O(\varepsilon^\gamma). \qquad (4.79)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the "error terms" (4.78) and (4.79) vanish as $\varepsilon\to 0$, as can be seen from Proposition 3.10 by taking into account the assumption (4.40). Since $g^1_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup g^1$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, we have $\liminf \Lambda^1_\varepsilon(g^1_\varepsilon) \ge \Lambda^1_0(g^1)$ and hence arrive at the lim inf estimate

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\left(\Lambda_\varepsilon(\varphi_\varepsilon) - \int_\Omega \varphi_\varepsilon\cdot l_\varepsilon\,\mathrm{d}x\right) \ge \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\Big(\Lambda^{\mathrm{large}}(G_\varepsilon, g^1) - \mathcal{L}^0(G_\varepsilon, g^1)\Big) \ge e_0,$$

where in order to get the last inequality we employed the minimality property of e_0. Since the right-hand side is independent of the specific choice of the subsequence, (4.76) now follows from (4.77). $\square$

5 A version of the geometric rigidity estimate for perforated domains

A central ingredient in the proof of the *a priori* estimate of Theorem 3.4 is a geometric rigidity estimate for the perforated domain Ω^1_ε, which allows one to control the $L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)$ distance to a single rotation of ∇u, $u \in H^1(\Omega)$, by the integral $\int_{\Omega^1_\varepsilon} \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(d))\,\mathrm{d}x$ with a constant independent of ε. The geometric rigidity estimate for bounded Lipschitz domains (see Theorem 5.1) has been developed in a seminal work by Friesecke, James and Müller in [23], where the following statement is proved.

Theorem 5.1 (Geometric rigidity estimate, see [23])**.** *Let Ω be an open, bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. There exists a constant $\overline{C}(\Omega)$ with the following property: for each $v \in H^1(\Omega)$ there is a rotation $R \in \mathrm{SO}(d)$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v(x) - R|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \overline{C}(\Omega) \int_\Omega \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla v(x), \mathrm{SO}(d))\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Moreover, the constant $\overline{C}(\Omega)$ is invariant under uniform scaling of Ω.

In [23] the above estimate leads to a rigorous derivation of the nonlinear bending theory for elastic plates from three-dimensional finite elasticity. Apart from this, it is also the key ingredient in the rigorous justification of linearised elasticity from finite elasticity as established in [20]. In this section we present a simple argument that shows that the rigidity constant associated to the perforated domain Ω^1_ε can be chosen independent of ε. We would like to remark that, independently of our work, a related result for domains with a finite number of circular ε-holes has been recently established in an unpublished work by Scardia and Zeppieri [35] in their analysis of dislocation energies.

Proposition 5.2. *Let Ω, Y_1 and Ω^1_ε be as assumed in Section 2. There exists a positive constant $C(\Omega, Y_1)$ that depends on the geometry of Ω and Y_1 only, such that the following holds: for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $v \in H^1(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)$ there exist a harmonic extension $\widetilde{v} \in H^1(\Omega)$ of v (i.e. $\tilde{v} = v$ in Ω^ε_1 and $\widetilde{v}$ satisfies* (3.9)*) and a rotation $R \in \mathrm{SO}(d)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\operatorname{dist}(\nabla \widetilde{v}, \mathrm{SO}(d))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq C(\Omega, Y_1)\,\|\operatorname{dist}(\nabla v, \mathrm{SO}(d))\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}\,, && (5.80)\\ \|\nabla v - R\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)} &\leq C(\Omega, Y_1)\|\operatorname{dist}(\nabla v, \mathrm{SO}(d))\|_{L^2(\Omega^1_\varepsilon)}. && (5.81) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since (5.81) is a direct consequence of (5.80) and Theorem 5.1, it suffices to prove (5.80). To this end let $\widetilde{v}$ denote the harmonic extension of v to Ω as introduced in Lemma 3.2. Define the following sets

$$Z_\varepsilon := \{\, \xi \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d \,:\, \xi + \varepsilon Y_1 \subset \Omega^1_\varepsilon \,\}, \qquad \widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{\xi \in Z_\varepsilon} (\xi + \varepsilon Y). \tag{5.82}$$

By the definition of Ω^1_ε, the functions $\widetilde{v}$ and v are identical on $\Omega \setminus \widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon$. Thus, it suffices to argue that

$$\int_{\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon} \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla \widetilde{v}(x), \mathrm{SO}(d))\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C \int_{\widehat{\Omega}_\varepsilon \cap \Omega^1_\varepsilon} \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla \widetilde{v}(x), \mathrm{SO}(d))\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{5.83}$$

For the argument, we introduce the re-scaled functions $U_\xi(y) := \varepsilon^{-1}\widetilde{v}(\xi + \varepsilon y)$ defined for $y \in Y$ and $\xi \in Z_\varepsilon$. By construction, we have $\nabla U_\xi(y) = \nabla \widetilde{v}(\xi + \varepsilon y)$; therefore, estimate (5.83) follows, provided

$$\int_Y \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla U_\xi(y), \mathrm{SO}(d))\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C \int_{Y_1} \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla U_\xi(y), \mathrm{SO}(d))\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{5.84}$$

holds for all $\xi \in Z_\varepsilon$ and a constant only depending on Y_1. Indeed, this is the case: let R_ξ be a minimiser of $\int_{Y_1} |\nabla U_\xi(y) - R_\xi|^2\,\mathrm{d}y$ in $\mathrm{SO}(d)$. Since $y \mapsto U_\xi(y) - R_\xi y$ is harmonic in Y_0, we find that

$$\int_Y |\nabla U_\xi - R_\xi|^2\,\mathrm{d}y \leq C \int_{Y_1} |\nabla U_\xi - R_\xi|^2\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

By the geometric rigidity estimate, Proposition 5.2, the right-hand side of the previous line is estimated by the right-side of (5.84) (up to a constant that only depends on Y_1). Moreover, the left-hand side of the previous inequality is clearly an upper bound for the left-hand side of (5.84). In conclusion, (5.84) follows. □

In situations when the boundary data of the deformation v in Proposition 5.2 are known, one can gain further information on the rotation R. Suppose for a moment that $v(x) := x + \varphi(x)$ with $\varphi \in H^1_0(\Omega)$. Then by partial integration we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v(x) - R|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi(x) - (R-I)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi(x)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x + |\Omega||R-I|^2,$$

which, together with geometric rigidity, implies

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v(x) - I|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \le \int_\Omega |\nabla v(x) - R|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \le C(\overline{\Omega}) \int_\Omega \operatorname{dist}^2(\nabla v, \mathrm{SO}(d)) \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

In the situation above we could eliminate arbitrary rotations, by appealing to the Dirichlet boundary condition. A refined version of this argument was given in [20], where also non-homogeneous boundary data are considered. For us it is sufficient to borrow a technical statement from [20]:

Lemma 5.3 (*cf.* Lemma 3.3 in [20]). *Let Ω be an open and bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and Γ a measurable subset of $\partial\Omega$ with positive $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$. For $F \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ we define*

$$|F|^2_\Gamma := \min_{b\in\mathbb{R}^d} \int_\Gamma |Fx - b|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x).$$

Then there exists a positive constant C such that

$$|F|^2 \le C\,|F|^2_\Gamma$$

for all matrices F that belong to $I - \mathrm{SO}(n)$.

Now, we can easily deduce the following result:

Proposition 5.4. *Let Ω and Γ as assumed in Section 2. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\Omega,\Gamma)$ such that for all $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $R \in \mathrm{SO}(n)$ with $u(x)|_\Gamma = Rx$ the estimate*

$$\|\nabla u - R\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\,\|\operatorname{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(n))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

holds.

Remark 5.5. *Note, that the statement of Proposition 5.4 is valid also for Ω^1_ε with a constant independent of ε. It is easy to see by applying consequently Proposition 5.2 and 5.4. We make use of this observation in the argument of Section 3 above.*

Proof of Proposition 5.4. According to Theorem 5.1 there exists a rotation $P \in \mathrm{SO}(n)$ with

$$\|\nabla u - P\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \overline{C}(\Omega)\,\|\operatorname{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(n))\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Thus,

$$\|\nabla u - R\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le 2\overline{C}(\Omega)\,\|\operatorname{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(n))\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\,|\Omega|\,|P-R|^2. \tag{5.85}$$

Define the map $v(x) := u(x) - Px + v_\Omega$ where $v_\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is chosen in such a way that v has zero mean value over Ω. Then by the Poincaré inequality we have

$$\|v\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)} \le c\,\|\nabla v\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le c\overline{C}(\Omega)\,\|\operatorname{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(n))\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

since $\nabla v = \nabla u - P$. Within this proof, c denotes a constant that may vary from line to line, but can be chosen in such a way that it depends on Ω and Γ only.

On the other hand, we have $v(x) = u(x) - Px + v_\Omega = (R-P)x + v_\Omega$ on Γ. Recall the definition of the semi-norm $|\cdot|_\Gamma$ from Lemma 5.3. By construction we see that

$$|R-P|_\Gamma^2 \leq \int_\Gamma |(R-P)x + v_\Omega|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \leq \int_{\partial\Omega} |v(x)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \leq c\,\|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 .$$

In the last estimate, the right-hand side is controlled by $\|\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(n))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$ and by virtue of Lemma 5.3, the left-hand side controls the distance $|R-P|^2$. This implies that

$$|R-P|^2 \leq c\,\|\mathrm{dist}(\nabla u, \mathrm{SO}(n))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

and, combining this with (5.85), the statement of the theorem now follows immediately. □

A Appendix: Two-scale convergence

In this section we gather basic definitions and properties of two-scale convergence (resp. periodic unfolding) following the lines in [29]. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open, bounded and satisfy $|\partial\Omega| = 0$. Following [1, 32] a bounded sequence $(u_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ is *two-scale convergent* to a function $u \in L^2(\Omega\times Y)$, if for all test functions $\psi \in L^2(\Omega; C_\#(Y))$ we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_\Omega u_\varepsilon(x)\psi(x, x/\varepsilon)\,\mathrm{d}x = \iint_{\Omega\times Y} u(x,y)\psi(x,y)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y.$$

In the present paper it is more convenient to work with the equivalent definition of two-scale convergence via periodic unfolding (see [16], [37], [29]). On $\mathbb{R}^d$ we define the mappings $[\cdot]$ and $\{\cdot\}$ such that

$$[\cdot] : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{Z}^d, \qquad \{\cdot\} : \mathbb{R}^d \to Y, \qquad x = [x] + \{x\} \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Definition A.1 (Unfolding operator). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be open and $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ a Lebesgue-measurable function. The periodic unfolding of u (on scale $\varepsilon > 0$) is defined via*

$$\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(u) : \mathbb{R}^d\times Y \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad (x,y) \mapsto u^*(\varepsilon[x/\varepsilon] + \varepsilon\{x/\varepsilon\})$$

where u^* denotes the extension of u to $\mathbb{R}^d$ by zero. For vector valued maps the periodic unfolding is defined componentwise.

The following statements are well-known and can be found in [16], [39].

Proposition A.2.

1. *(Isometry property). For all $\varepsilon > 0$ the mapping $\varphi \mapsto (\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon\varphi)$ defines a (non-surjective) linear isometry from $L^2(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times Y)$.*
2. *(Product rule). If $u, v \in L^2(\Omega)$, then $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(uv) = \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(u)\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(v) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times Y)$.*
3. *(Integral identity). Let $f : Y\times\mathbb{R}^k \to [0,\infty]$ be a Borel map. Then for all measurable maps $\varphi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^k$ one has*

$$\int_\Omega f(\{x/\varepsilon\}, \varphi(x))\,\mathrm{d}x = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times Y} f(y, \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(\varphi)(x,y))\,\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Definition A.3. *Let $(u_\varepsilon) \subset L^2(\Omega)$, $u \in L^2(\Omega\times Y)$, and let u^* denote the extension of u to $\mathbb{R}^d\times Y$ by zero.*

1. *We say that (u_ε) strongly two-scale converges to u and write "$u_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{2} u$ in $L^2(\Omega\times Y)$", if $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to u^*$ strongly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times Y)$.*
2. *We say that (u_ε) weakly two-scale converges to $u \in L^2(\Omega\times Y)$ and write "$u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} u$ in $L^2(\Omega\times Y)$", if $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \rightharpoonup u^*$ weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d\times Y)$.*

Proposition A.4.

1. *If* $u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} u$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$*, then* $||u_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)}$ *is bounded for* $\varepsilon \to 0$*.*
2. *If* $u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} u$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *then for any* Y*-periodic* $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ *one has* $a(x/\varepsilon)u_\varepsilon(x) \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} a(y)u(x,y)$ *in* $L^2(\Omega \times Y)$*.*
3. *We have* $u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\to} u$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$*, if and only if* $u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} u$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *and* $||u_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} \to ||u||_{L^2(\Omega\times Y)}$*.*
4. *If* $\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} ||u_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} < \infty$*, then, up to a subsequence,* $u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} u$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *for a map* $u \in L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$*.*
5. *If* $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$*,* $v_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup v$*, in* $L^2(\Omega \times Y)$*, then* $\int_\Omega u_\varepsilon v_\varepsilon \,\mathrm{d}x \to \int_{\Omega\times Y} uv \,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y$*.*

Proposition A.5. *Let* (u_ε) *be a sequence in* $H^1(\Omega)$ *and* $u \in H^1(\Omega)$*.*

1. *If* $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ *in* $H^1(\Omega)$*, then, up to a subsequence,* $\nabla u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla u + \nabla_y \psi$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *for a map* $\psi \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y))$*.*
2. *If* u_ε *and* $\varepsilon\nabla u_\varepsilon$ *are bounded in* $L^2(\Omega)$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$*, then, up to a subsequence,* $u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} u_0$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *and* $\nabla u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y u_0$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *for a map* $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y))$*.*
3. *If* $u_\varepsilon \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ *for all* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} ||\nabla u_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} < \infty$*, then, up to a subsequence,* $||u_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega)} = O(\varepsilon)$ *and* $\nabla u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y \psi(x,y)$ *for a map* $\psi \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_0(Y_0))$*.*
4. *If* $u_\varepsilon \in H^1_0(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)$ *for all* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} ||\varepsilon\nabla u_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Omega^0_\varepsilon)} < \infty$*, then, up to a subsequence,* $u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} u_0$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *and* $\nabla u_\varepsilon \overset{2}{\rightharpoonup} \nabla_y u_0$ *in* $L^2(\Omega{\times}Y)$ *for a map* $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega; H^1_\#(Y))$*.*

Lemma A.6 (Attouch's diagonalisation, see [2])**.** *Assume* $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$*,* $h : [0,\infty)^2 \to [-\infty, +\infty]$*. Then there is a mapping* $\varepsilon \mapsto \delta(\varepsilon)$ *such that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \delta(\varepsilon) \to 0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} h(\varepsilon, \delta(\varepsilon)) \leq \limsup_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} h(\varepsilon, \delta).$$

In particular, if $h \geq 0$ *and* $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} h(\varepsilon, \delta) = 0$*, then* $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} h(\varepsilon, \delta(\varepsilon)) = 0$*.*

References

[1] G. Allaire, 1992. Homogenisation and two-scale convergence, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **23**(6), 1482–1518.

[2] H. Attouch, 1984. *Variational convergence for functions and operators*, Pitman Advanced Pub. Program.

[3] M. Bellieud, 2010. Torsion effects in elastic composites with high contrast. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **41**(6), 2514–2553.

[4] M. Bellieud, I. Gruais, 2005. Homogenization of an elastic material reinforced by very stiff or heavy fibres. Non-local effects. Memory effects. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* **84**, 55–96.

[5] G. Bouchitté, D. Felbacq, 2004. Homogenization near resonances and artificial magnetism from dielectrics. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **339** (5), 377-382.

[6] A. Braides, V. Chiadò Piat and A. Piatnitski, 2004. A variational approach to double-porosity problems, *Asymptot. Anal.* **39**, 281–308.

[7] A. Braides, A. Defranceschi, 1998. *Homogenization of Multiple Integrals.* Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications 12, New York: Oxford University Press.

[8] A. Braides, L. Truskinovsky, 2008. Asymptotic expansions by Γ-convergence, *Continuum Mech. Thermodyn.* **20**, 21–62.

[9] M. Briane, 2001. Optimal conditions of convergence and effects of anisotropy in the homogenization of non-uniformly elliptic problems, *Asymptot. Anal.* **25**, 271–297.

[10] M. Briane, 2002. Homogenisation of non-uniformly bounded operators: critical barrier for non-local effects, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **164**, 73–101.

[11] M. Camar-Eddine, P. Seppecher, 2003. Determination of the closure of the set of elasticity functionals, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **170** (3), 211–245.

[12] M. Cherdantsev, 2009. Spectral convergence for high-contrast elliptic periodic problems with a defect via homogenization, *Mathematika* **55** (1–2), 29–57.

[13] K. D. Cherednichenko, V. P. Smyshlyaev and V. V. Zhikov, 2006. Non-local homogenised limits for composite media with highly anisotropic periodic fibres, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **136**(1), 87–114.

[14] M. Cherdantsev, K. D. Cherednichenko, 2010. Two-scale Γ-convergence of integral functionals and its application to homogenisation of nonlinear high-contrast periodic composites, *submitted.*

[15] P. G. Ciarlet, 1988. *Mathematical Elasticity, Vol. I: Three-Dimensional Elasticity,* North-Holland, Amsterdam.

[16] D. Cioranescu, 1999. *An Introduction to Homogenisation,* Oxford University Press.

[17] D. Cioranescu, A. Damlamian, R. De Arcangelis, 2006. Homogenisation of quasiconvex integrals via the periodic unfolding method, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **37**(5), 1435–1453.

[18] E. De Giorgi, T. Franzoni, 1975. Su un tipo di convergenza variazionale. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Mat. Natur.* **58**, 842–850.

[19] G. Dal Maso, 1993. *An Introduction to* Γ*-Convergence,* Birkhäuser.

[20] G. Dal Maso, M. Negri, D. Percivale, 2002. Linearized elasticity as Γ-limit of finite elasticity, *Set-Valued Analysis* **10**, 165-183.

[21] B. Dacorogna, 2000. *Direct Methods in Calculus of Variations*, Springer.

[22] I. Fonseca, S. Müller, P. Pedregal, 1998. Analysis of concentration and oscillation effects generated by gradients, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **29**(3) (1998), 736–756.

[23] G. Friesecke, R. D. James, S. Müller, 2002. A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **LV**, 1461–1506.

[24] U. Hornung (*Ed.*), 1997. *Homogenisation and Porous Media,* Springer.

[25] D. Jerison, C. E. Kenig, 1995. The inhomogeneous Dirichlet problem in Lipschitz domains, *J. Func. Anal.* **130**, 161–219.

[26] I. V. Kamotski, V. P. Smyshlyaev, 2006. Localised modes due to defects in high contrast periodic media via homogenisation, *submitted.*

[27] J. Kristensen, 1994. Finite functionals and Young mesaures generated by gradients of Sobolev functions. *MAT-Report 1994-34, Math. Inst., Technical University of Denmark.*

[28] G. W. Milton, N.-A. P. Nicorovici , R. C. McPhedran, K. D. Cherednichenko and Z. Jacob, 2008. Solutions in folded geometries, and associated cloaking due to anomalous resonance, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 115021.

[29] A. Mielke, A.M. Timofte, 2007. Two-scale homogenization for evolutionary variational inequalities via the energetic formulation, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **39**(2), 642–668.

[30] S. Müller, 1987. Homogenization of nonconvex integral functionals and cellular elastic materials, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **99**(3), 189–212.

[31] S. Neukamm, 2010. Homogenization, linearization and dimension reduction in elasticity with variational methods, *Ph.D. thesis,* Technische Universität München.

[32] G. Nguetseng, 1989. A general convergence result for a functional related to the theory of homogenization, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **20** (3), 608–623.

[33] O. A. Oleinik, A. S. Shamaev, G. A. Yosifian, 1992. *Mathematical problems in elasticity and homogenization,* North-Holland

[34] J. B. Pendry, D. Schurig, D. R. Smith, 2006. Controlling electromagnetic fields, *Science* **312** (5781), 1780–1782

[35] L. Scardia, C. Zeppieri, 2011. Gradient theory for plasticity as the Gamma-limit of a nonlinear dislocation energy, *preprint.*

[36] V. P. Smyshlyaev, 2009. Propagation and localization of elastic waves in highly anisotropic composites via homogenization, *Mechanics of Materials* **41**(4), 434–447.

[37] A. Visintin, 2006. Towards a two-scale calculus, *Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations* **12**(3), 371.

[38] K. Zhang, 1997. Quasiconvex functions, SO(d) and two elastic wells, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire* **14**(6), 759–785.

[39] V. V. Zhikov, 2000. On an extension of the method of two-scale convergence and its applications, *Sb. Math.* **191**(7), 973–1014.

[40] V. V. Zhikov, 2005. A note on Sobolev spaces. *J. Math. Sci.* **129**(1), 3593–3595.

[41] V. V. Zhikov, S. M. Kozlov, O. A. Oleinik, 1994. *Homogenisation of Differential Operators and Integral Functionals,* Springer.